SISSA 217/92/EP
November, 1992

arXiv:hep-th/9211121v1 25 Nov 1992

TOPOLOGICAL TWIST IN FOUR DIMENSIONS, R-DUALITY AND HYPERINSTANTONS

Damiano Anselmi and Pietro Frè

SISSA-International School for Advanced Studies

via Beirut 2, I-34100 Trieste, Italy

and I.N.F.N.- Sezione di Trieste, Trieste, Italy

ABSTRACT. In this paper we continue the programme of topologically twisting N=2 theories in D=4, focusing on the coupling of vector multiplets to N=2 supergravity. We show that in the minimal case, namely when the special geometry prepotential $F(X)$ is a quadratic polynomial, the theory has a so far unknown on shell $U(1)$ symmetry, that we name R-duality. R-duality is a generalization of the chiral-dual on shell symmetry of N=2 pure supergravity and of the R-symmetry of N=2 super Yang-Mills theory. Thanks to this, the theory can be topologically twisted and topologically shifted, precisely as pure N=2 supergravity, to yield a natural coupling of topological gravity to topological Yang-Mills theory. The gauge-fixing condition that emerges from the twisting is the self-duality condition on the gauge field-stength and on the spin connection. Hence our theory reduces to intersection theory in the moduli-space of gauge instantons living in gravitational instanton backgrounds. We remark that, for deep properties of the parent N=2 theory, the topological Yang-Mills theory we obtain by taking the flat space limit of our gravity coupled Lagrangian is different from the Donaldson theory constructed by Witten. Whether this difference is substantial and what its geometrical implications may be is yet to be seen.

We also discuss the topological twist of the hypermultiplets leading to topological quaternionic σ-models. The instantons of these models, named by us hyperinstantons, correspond to a notion of triholomorphic mappings discussed in the paper.

In all cases the new ghost number is the sum of the old ghost number plus the R-duality charge. The observables described by the theory are briefly discussed.

In conclusion, the topological twist of the complete N=2 theory defines intersection theory in the moduli space of gauge instantons plus gravitational instantons plus hyperinstantons. This is possibly a new subject for further mathematical investigation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Topological Field Theories have stirred a lot of interest, both in two and in four dimensions [1]. Their general feature is that of recasting intersection theory in the moduli-space of some suitable geometrical structure into the language of standard quantum field-theory, specifically into the framework of the path-integral. Indeed the point-independent correlation functions of these peculiar field-theories represent intersection integrals of cohomology classes in the given moduli-space.

Hystorically, the first topological field-theory that has been introduced, is the topological version of 4D Yang-Mills theory [2], sometimes named Donaldson theory. It deals with the moduli-spaces of Yang-Mills instantons and its correlation functions describe Donaldson invariants [3]. A lot of attention has also been devoted to topological sigma models in two dimensions [4]. In this case one probes the moduli-space of holomorphic mappings from the world-sheet to a complex target space. Theories that have a close relation with topological sigma-models are the topological versions of N=2 Landau-Ginzburg models [5]. They have provided an interesting arena for the study of the moduli-spaces associated with Calabi-Yau manifolds [6], a topic of primary interest in connection with the effective Lagrangians of superstring models. In a different, but closely related set up, the coupling of topological matter multiplets to topological 2D gravity [7] has been used to investigate non critical string theories and relations have been established with the integrable hierarchies discovered in matrix models [8].

From a formal field-theoretic point of view the general framework of topological field-theories is that of geometrical BRST-quantization [9]. One deals with a classical Lagrangian that has a very large symmetry, such as the group of continuous deformations of a gauge-connection or of a metric and which, therefore, is a topological-invariant-density (i.e. some characteristic class of some fibre-bundle). To this symmetry one applies the standard BRST quantization scheme and, in this way, one obtains a topological BRST-cohomology, namely a double elliptic complex involving both the standard exterior derivative $d^2 = 0$ and a

second nilpotent operator (the Slavnov operator $s^2 = 0$) that anticommutes with the first: $sd + ds = 0$. The true geometrical and physical content of the theory emerges when one fixes the gauge: indeed the gauge fixing condition is, normally, some kind of self-duality condition that reduces the space of physical states to the space of suitable *instantons*.

In this perspective the relevance of the topological twist is appreciated. This is a procedure, discovered by Witten [2], that extracts a topological field-theory with its gauge already fixed to a suitable instanton condition from an N=2 supersymmetric ordinary field-theory. Actually the very first example of topological field-theory, namely Donaldson theory, was constructed in this way starting from N=2 super Yang-Mills theory. The basic ingredients of the twist procedure are:

i) the possibility of changing the spins of the fields, by redefining a new Lorentz group as the diagonal of the old one (or a factor thereof) with an internal symmetry group, in such a way that, after the twist, the top spin boson of each supersymmetric multiplet and one of its fermionic partners acquire the same spin in the new theory;

ii) the existence of an additional U(1)-symmetry of the old theory, such that, redefining also the ghost number as the old one plus this particular U(1)-charge, the anticommuting partners of the bosons, that have acquired the same spin in the twist procedure, have, in the new theory, ghost number one, while their bosonic partners remain with ghost number zero. In this way the old fermions become the ghost associated with the topological symmetry.

The twist not only provides a constructive procedure for topological field-theories but also illuminates the topological character of a sector of the parent theory. This way of thinking has been most successfully implemented in two-dimensions. There the (Euclidean) Lorentz group is SO(2) and it can be easily redefined by taking its diagonal with the U(1) automorphism group of N=2 supersymmetry. In this simple case, the same U(1) provides also the charge to shift the ghost numbers. The result, as already mentioned, is given by either the topological sigma-models, or the topological Landau-Ginzburg models, or their coupling to topological 2D gravity. The topological sector of the original N=2 theory that is unveiled by this twist procedure is that of the chiral correlation functions.

In four-dimensions the twist procedure relies once more on the properties of N=2 supersymmetry, but involves many more subtleties, so that the programme of topologically twisting all N=2, D=4 theories needs deeper thinking. This programme has been started in [10] by twisting pure N=2 supergravity: in the present paper we push this programme one step further by twisting N=2 supergravity coupled to vector multiplets and by discussing the effect of the twist on N=2 hypermultiplets. The accomplished result of the present paper is given by a D=4 topological Yang-Mills theory coupled to topological D=4 gravity, the space of physical states being the moduli-space of gauge-instantons living in the background of gravitational instantons. One of the properties of this theory is that it does not seem to reduce to Donaldson theory in the limit where the gravitational coupling is switched off. Hence it seems to define a different topological Yang-Mills theory. Whether this difference is substantial or not is still to be clarified; anyhow it is not accidental rather it is deeply rooted in the properties of N=2 supersymmetry.

Indeed the subtleties one encounters in twisting N=2,D=4 theories relate mostly to the second item of the twisting programme, namely to the identification of the U(1) symmetry needed to shift the ghost-number. This identification is involved with the non-linear sigma model structure of the original N=2 theory, in particular with the special Kähler geometry of the vector multiplet coupling. In this paper we find out that the required U(1)-symmetry, named by us R-duality, exists, in the supergravity coupled case, if the Special Kähler manifold is chosen to be $SU(1,n)/SU(n)\times U(1)$, the so named minimal coupling case. In the flat case the needed U(1) also exists, as Witten construction shows, if the minimal coupling is selected. The point is that the minimal coupling in flat space and in curved space correspond to different unequivalent sigma model geometries: the flat C^n-manifold versus the special Kähler manifold $SU(1,n)/SU(n)\times U(1)$. This shows how the flat space limit of the gravity coupled topological Yang-Mills theory is in principle different from Donaldson theory as constructed by Witten.

Other subtleties of the D=4 topological twist were already encountered and resolved in our previous paper on pure N=2 supergravity. Indeed the greater complexity of N=2

supergravity with respect to N=2 super Yang-Mills forced us [10] to generalize the procedure of topological twist as introduced by Witten [2] in N=2 super Yang-Mills and at the same time lead us to reach a deeper understanding of its structure. In particular, we stress that the twist acts only on the Lorentz indices and not on the space-time indices [10] and this is quite natural in the formalism of differential forms. This feature of the twist avoids the problem encountered by Witten in Ref. [2], namely that the twisting procedure is meaningful only when space-time is R^4. We shall come back on this aspect extensively in this paper. When one studies the topological sector of N=2 matter coupled supergravity, one soon realizes that other aspects of the twist still need a better understanding. In particular, as we already pointed out, the fundamental question is the following: what is, in general terms, the $U(1)$ symmetry that leads to the ghost number of the topological version of a given theory? In N=2 super Yang-Mills, as well as in N=2 pure supergravity there is only one $U(1)$ internal symmetry (apart from global dimensional rescalings, that are not relevant to our discussion) and so either it works or not. Fortunately it works. However, in N=2 supergravity coupled to vector multiplets, there can be more that one internal $U(1)$; think for example of the $U(1)$ Kähler transformation or some $U(1)$ subgroup of the group of duality transformations [11] (at least when the vectors are not gauged). Anyway neither of these two known possibilities has the correct properties to become a ghost number and further on we show that indeed they cannot do the job. On the other hand one expects that a twist is possible, since the theory of topological gravity coupled to topological Yang-Mills should exist. In Ref. [10] we have shown how to produce a gauge-free algebra and generic observables for *any* topological theory and it would be very surprising to find that it is impossible to choose any kind of instantons to fix the topological symmetry and a gauge fermion to give a lagrangian to the theory. So, we start our work with the belief that if a suitable $U(1)$ internal charge is missing, this is because it is not known and not because it does not exist. As anticipated, it will be named R-duality, for reasons that we shall explain. First we define it and this lead us to single out the basic properties an internal $U(1)$ symmetry should have in order to give ghost number. Then we shall explicitly prove invariance of the minimally coupled theory

under this symmetry.

Our paper is organized as follows. In section II we make some general remarks on the possibility that minimal N=2 matter coupled supergravity possesses the desired internal $U(1)$ symmetry (R-duality). In section III we recall the structure of N=2 matter coupled supergravity in the rheonomy framework. In section IV we fully determine R-duality and prove that it is indeed an on shell symmetry of the theory. In section V we present the topologically twisted-topologically shifted theory (the gauge-free algebra, the complete BRST algebra, the topological gauge-fixings, the observables, the gauge-fermion). Finally, in section VI we discuss the twist of quaternionic matter multiplets coupled to N=2 supergravity and along with this discussion, we summarize all the steps of the twisting procedure in four dimensions, improved by the experience of the present paper.

II. GENERAL REMARKS ON R-DUALITY

In this section we discuss the possibility that minimal N=2 matter coupled supergravity is R-duality invariant. This internal $U(1)$ charge will add to the ghost number to define the ghost number of the topologically twisted theory. Thus we shall be able to extend the procedure of topological twist and topological shift of Ref. [10] in a rather direct way.

Let us first make some simple remarks about the properties of the chiral-dual invariance displayed by N=2 simple supergravity. These properties will guide us in finding the desired generalization to the matter coupled case. We use the same notation of Ref. [10]. Consider the Bianchi identity of the graviphoton A, that is

$$\mathcal{D}R^{\otimes} + 2\epsilon_{AB}\bar{\psi}_A \wedge \rho_B = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

its equation of motion,

$$4i\epsilon_{AB}\bar{\rho}_A \wedge \gamma_5\psi_B - \mathcal{D}(F^{ab}V^c \wedge V^d)\epsilon_{abcd} = 0, \tag{2.2}$$

the rheonomic parametrization of the graviphoton curvature $R^{\otimes}$,

$$R^{\otimes} = F_{ab} V^a \wedge V^b, \tag{2.3}$$

and the on shell chiral-dual transformation, i. e.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}\psi_A &= i\gamma_5 \psi_A \\ \hat{\delta} F_{ab} &= -2i\tilde{F}_{ab} = \epsilon_{abcd} F^{cd}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

In Ref. [10] it was noted that the chiral-dual variation of the Bianchi identity is the equation of motion and *viceversa*. This is evident if we re-write the Bianchi identity of the graviphoton and its equation of motion in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} d[R^{\otimes} - \epsilon_{AB} \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \psi_B] &= 0, \\ d[\epsilon_{abcd} F^{ab} V^c \wedge V^d - 2i\epsilon_{AB} \bar{\psi}^A \wedge \gamma_5 \psi^B] &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, let us see what is the condition for the transformation (2.4) to be well defined, i. e. what is required for the existence of a $\hat{\delta} A$ compatible with (2.4). One immediately finds

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{abcd} F^{cd} V^a \wedge V^b &= \hat{\delta}[F_{ab} V^a \wedge V^b] = \\ &= \hat{\delta} R^{\otimes} = d\hat{\delta} A + 2i\epsilon_{AB} \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \gamma_5 \psi_B. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

So, $\epsilon_{abcd} F^{cd} V^a \wedge V^b - 2i\epsilon_{AB} \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \gamma_5 \psi_B$ must be an exact form and we focus on the case in which a necessary and sufficient condition for this to be true is that the form is closed, i. e. $d[\epsilon_{abcd} F^{cd} V^a \wedge V^b - 2i\epsilon_{AB} \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \gamma_5 \psi_B] = 0$. This is precisely the equation of motion for the graviphoton (2.2). Consequently, the $U(1)$ transformation is defined on shell and only on shell. This way of reasoning is a natural generalization of the well known case of electromagnetism and it will directly extend to N=2 matter coupled supergravity.

What do we expect R-duality to be like? Obviously, it should reduce to the known results both on the gravitational multiplet when matter is suppressed and on the vector multiplets when gravity is switched off. In other words, it should be a dual transformation on the graviphoton (that is why we call it *duality*), a chiral transformation on the fermions and should leave the graviton and the matter vectors inert. The scalars of the vector multiplets

should have charges $+2$ and -2. Consequently, on the fields of the vector multiplets the symmetry we are seeking should act as the usual internal $U(1)$ symmetry of N=2 super Yang-Mills, which is an R-symmetry [12]. Finally, it should be possible to gauge the matter vectors (but not the graviphoton) while preserving the symmetry.

We expect R-duality not to be present in the most general case, i. e. with any special Kähler manifold, but only in the simplest case, namely for minimal coupling [13]. This is suggested by the fact that something similar seems to happen even in the case of flat N=2 super Yang-Mills theory. As a matter of fact, the theory involves the choice of an arbitrary flat special geometry prepotential $F(X)$, which is a holomorphic homogeneous function of degree two of the simplectic sections X_Λ [14]. As a result, the lagrangian involves a coupling matrix $f^{ij}(z)$, which, in flat coordinates $z_i = \frac{X_i}{X_0}$, depends holomorphically on the scalars z_i and is given by the second derivative of F, $f^{ij}(z) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}F(X(z))$ [14]. The kinetic lagrangian of the vectors has the following form

$$F^i_{\mu\nu}F^{j\mu\nu}\mathrm{Re}\, f^{ij} - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F^i_{\mu\nu}F^j_{\rho\sigma}\mathrm{Im}\, f^{ij}. \tag{2.7}$$

Only when $f^{ij}(z) = \delta^{ij}$, namely when F is quadratic, there is an evident R-invariance, since if z has a nonvanishing charge, then the only neutral holomorphic function of z is the constant. In other words, the topological twist appears to be possible only in one case, although the negative result that R-symmetry is barred in nonminimal coupling has not been established in a conclusive way. Indeed, we shall prove that R-duality exists in minimal matter coupled N=2 supergravity, but we shall not prove that this is the only possible case. There could be some unexpected field redefinitions that make it work in more general cases, even if they presumably cannot make it suitable for a topological twist. Uniqueness remains, for the time being, just our conjecture.

We recall that in topological Yang-Mills theory the chiral anomaly becomes ghost number anomaly after the twist and can be described by saying that the functional measure has a definite nonvanishing ghost number. Consequently, only the amplitudes of observables that have a total ghost number opposite to this value can be nontrivial. These features of ghost

number are present also in topological gravity with or without matter. In Ref. [15] it is shown that the dual invariance of Maxwell theory in external gravity is anomalous. In topological gravity we thus expect a ghost number anomaly which is due not only to the anomalous chiral behaviour of the fermions, but also to the anomalous dual behaviour of the graviphoton. In other words one has to take care of the zero modes of the graviphoton, besides those of the fermions.

Let us now derive some *a priori* information about R-duality. As in Ref. [10] to each field of the theory we assign a set of labels ${}^c(L,R,I)^g_f$, where L is the representation of $SU(2)_L$, R is the representation of $SU(2)_R$, I is the representation of $SU(2)_I$, c is the $U(1)_I$ charge, g the ghost number and f the form number. If the twist acts on $SU(2)_R$, then after the twist we have objects described by $(L, R\otimes I)^{g+c}_f$. In this case the left handed components of gravitinos and gauginos must necessarily have $U(1)_I$ charge $+1$, since they are the only fermions that have the correct spin content to give the topological ghosts after the twist. For example, the left handed components of the gravitinos are characterized by $(\frac{1}{2},0,\frac{1}{2})^0_1$ and give $(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})_1$ after the twist, and the vierbein V^a is also a $(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})_1$ object. Similarly, the left handed components of the gauginos become $(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})_0$ after the twist: let us call them λ_a. The vector bosons, however, are Lorentz scalars, so they give $(0,0)^0_1$. Consequently, the correct topological ghosts can only be $\lambda_a V^a$.

The charge of the right handed components of gravitinos and gauginos is fixed to be -1 by the fact that they are the natural candidates to become the topological antighosts, as far as their Lorentz transformation properties are concerned. As a check, we can also see that the charge of the right handed gravitinos is independently fixed by the following argument to the value $c=-1$. The supersymmetry charges must also transform. In fact, the right handed components of the supersymmetry ghosts, which are the ghost partners of the right handed gravitinos and so must have the same charge, are characterized by $(0,\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})^1_0$ and give $(0,1)_0\oplus(0,0)_0$ after the twist. This is the only possibility to obtain a scalar zero form from the supersymmetry ghosts and we recall [10] that the $(0,0)_0$ component must be topologically shifted by a constant in order to define the BRST symmetry of the topological

theory. This implies $g + c = 0$ for the right handed components of the supersymmetry ghosts, and so $c = -1$.

We conclude that on any of the so far considered fermions, collectively denoted by λ (supersymmetry ghosts included), R-duality acts as follows

$$\hat{\delta}\lambda_L = \lambda_L$$
$$\hat{\delta}\lambda_R = -\lambda_R, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\hat{\delta}$ denotes R-duality and λ_L, λ_R are the left and right handed components, respectively. This automatically rules out the $U(1)$ Kähler transformation as a candidate for R-duality, since the $U(1)$ Kähler charges of the gaugino and gravitino left handed components are opposite to each other [16]. Note that the previous reasonings are not applicable to the case of hypermultiplets. Indeed, we shall find that the left handed components of the spinors contained in these multiplets have charge -1, while the right handed ones have charge $+1$ (Section VI).

Once we have fixed the charges of the fermions, the R-duality transformations of the bosons are uniquely fixed by requiring on shell consistency with supersymmetry, δ_ε, i. e.

$$[\hat{\delta}, \delta_\varepsilon] = 0. \tag{2.9}$$

Before giving the complete result obtained from this requirement, we recall the structure of N=2 matter coupled supergravity.

III. N=2 SUPERGRAVITY PLUS VECTOR MULTIPLETS IN THE MINIMAL COUPLING CASE

By definition, N=2 supergravity minimally coupled to n vector multiplets corresponds to the case where the special Kähler manifold spanned by the vector multiplet scalars is the homogeneous manifold $\mathcal{M} = \frac{SU(1,n)}{SU(n)\otimes U(1)}$. In the language of holomorphic prepotentials this corresponds to the choice $F(X) = \frac{1}{4}({X_0}^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} {X_i}^2)$. An easy way to obtain the explicit

form of this theory, in the rheonomy framework that we use throughout the paper, is by truncation of N=3 matter coupled supergravity [17,18]. If we are interested in the case of just one vector multiplet, it is more convenient to truncate pure N=4 $SO(4)$ supergravity [19]. As a matter of fact, we first tested our conjectures using this trick (which we do not discuss here) and, after having found that their were correct, we extended them to n vector multiplets in the way we now present.

The gravitational multiplet is $(V^a, \psi_A, \psi^A, A_0)$ (the index A taking the values $1, 2$), where V^a is the vierbein, ψ_A are the gravitino left handed components ($\gamma_5 \psi_A = \psi_A$), ψ^A are the right handed ones ($\gamma_5 \psi^A = -\psi^A$) and A_0 is the graviphoton. The n vector multiplets are labelled by an index $i = 1, \dots n$ and are denoted by $(A_i, \lambda_i^A, \lambda^i_A, z_i, \bar{z}^i)$, A_i being the vector bosons, λ_i^A the gaugino left handed components, λ^i_A the right handed ones, z_i and $\bar{z}^i$ the scalars. Vierbein, gravitinos, graviphoton and vector bosons are 1-forms, all the other fields being 0-forms.

A special Kähler manifold $SK(n)$ is a Hodge Kähler manifold providing the base manifold for a flat $Sp(2n+2)$ simplectic vector bundle $\mathcal{S} \xrightarrow{\pi} SK(n)$, whose holomorphic sections $(X_\Lambda, \frac{\partial F}{\partial X_\Lambda})$, $\Lambda = 0, 1 \dots n$, are given in terms of a prepotential $F(X)$, homogeneous of degree two in the $n+1$ variables $X_\Lambda(z)$ (z belonging to $SK(n)$). It is common to introduce the following expressions

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \partial^\Lambda \partial^\Sigma F(X), \\
N^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= F^{\Lambda\Sigma} + \bar{F}^{\Lambda\Sigma}, \\
G &= -\ln(N^{\Lambda\Sigma} X_\Lambda \bar{X}_\Sigma), \\
L_\Lambda &= e^{\frac{G}{2}} X_\Lambda, \\
f^i_\Lambda &= \partial^i L_\Lambda + \frac{1}{2} G^i L_\Lambda, \\
\mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= -\bar{F}^{\Lambda\Sigma} + \frac{1}{N^{\Delta\Gamma} L_\Delta L_\Gamma} N^{\Lambda\Pi} L_\Pi N^{\Sigma\Xi} L_\Xi,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.1}
$$

where G is the Kähler potential, $\partial^\Lambda = \frac{\partial}{\partial X_\Lambda}$, $\partial^i = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$, $G^i = \partial^i G$.

In the minimal case, if we use the special coordinates $z_\Lambda = \frac{X_\Lambda}{X_0}$ ($z_0 = 1$) and furthermore

we impose $X_0 \equiv 1$, then $F(z) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} z_i z_i)$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= = \frac{1}{2}\eta^{\Lambda\Sigma} = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{diag}(1, -1, \ldots -1), \\
N^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \eta^{\Lambda\Sigma}, \\
G &= -\ln a, \\
L_\Lambda &= \frac{z_\Lambda}{\sqrt{a}}, \\
f^i_\Lambda &= \begin{pmatrix} f^i_0 \\ f^i_j \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{a\sqrt{a}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{z}^i \\ a\delta^i_j + z_j \bar{z}^i \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{N}^{00} & \mathcal{N}^{0j} \\ \mathcal{N}^{i0} & \mathcal{N}^{ij} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2(1 - z_i z_i)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + z_l z_l & -2z_j \\ -2z_i & \delta_{ij}(1 - z_l z_l) + 2 z_i z_j \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.2}
$$

where $a = 1 - z_i \bar{z}^i$.

In the notation of N=3 matter coupled supergravity [17,18], the manifold $\frac{\mathcal{G}}{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{SU(3,n)}{SU(3)\otimes SU(n)\otimes U(1)}$ (which becomes $\mathcal{M} = \frac{SU(1,n)}{SU(n)\otimes U(1)}$ when truncating to N=2), is described by a matrix $L_\Lambda{}^\Sigma(z, \bar{z})$ that depends on the coordinates $z^A_i, \bar{z}^A_i \equiv z^i_A$, where $A = 1, 2, 3$, $i = 1, \ldots n$, $\Lambda = (A, i)$. The N=2 truncation is realized by setting to zero the fermions that have index $A = 3$, the bosons with $A = 1, 2$, the spin 1/2 of the N=3 graviton multiplet and the $SU(3)$-singlet spin 1/2 fields of the vector multiplets. The L matrix is [17,18]

$$
L_\Lambda{}^\Sigma(z, \bar{z}) = \begin{pmatrix} L_1{}^1 & L_1{}^2 & L_1{}^3 & L_1{}^j \\ L_2{}^1 & L_2{}^2 & L_2{}^3 & L_2{}^j \\ L_3{}^1 & L_3{}^2 & L_3{}^3 & L_3{}^j \\ L_i{}^1 & L_i{}^2 & L_i{}^3 & L_i{}^j \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \bar{z}^j \\ 0 & 0 & z_i & M_i{}^j \end{pmatrix},
\tag{3.3}
$$

where $M_i{}^j = \sqrt{a}\delta^j_i + \frac{z_i \bar{z}^j}{|z|^2}(1 - \sqrt{a})$. The correspondence with the N=2 notation is the following

$$
L_\Lambda{}^\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & L_0 & f^k_0 (g^{-\frac{1}{2}})_k{}^j \\ 0 & 0 & L_i & f^k_i (g^{-\frac{1}{2}})_k{}^j \end{pmatrix},
\tag{3.4}
$$

where $(g^{-\frac{1}{2}})_i{}^j = \sqrt{a}\delta^j_i + \frac{z_i \bar{z}^j}{|z|^2}(a - \sqrt{a})$. Note that $\frac{1}{a} M_i{}^k \frac{1}{a} M_k{}^j = g_i{}^j \equiv \partial_i \partial^j G$, where $\partial_i = \partial^{i*}$; $g_i{}^j$ is the metric tensor of the Kähler manifold $\mathcal{M}$. We thus define $\frac{1}{a} M_i{}^j = (g^{\frac{1}{2}})_i{}^j$, and $a M^{-1}{}_i{}^j = (g^{-\frac{1}{2}})_i{}^j$.

The N=2 truncation of the $\frac{\mathcal{G}}{\mathcal{H}}$ connection $\Omega_\Lambda{}^\Sigma$ is

$$\Omega_\Lambda{}^\Sigma = (L^{-1})_\Lambda{}^\Pi (dL_\Pi{}^\Sigma + g f_\Pi{}^{\Delta\Gamma} A_\Delta L_\Gamma{}^\Sigma) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -iQ & P^j \\ 0 & 0 & P_i & Q_i^j + \frac{i}{n}\delta_i^j Q \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.5}$$

In particular, Q is the gauged Kähler connection and P^i is the gauged vierbein on $\mathcal{M}$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= -\frac{i}{2}(G^i \nabla z_i - G_i \nabla \bar{z}^i), \\ P_i &= (g^{\frac{1}{2}})_i{}^j \nabla z_j \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

and $P^i = P_i^*$. From now on, let Λ take only the values $(A = 3, i = 1, \dots n)$. For convenience, the index 3 will be eventually replaced by a 0 or simply omitted, when there can be no misunderstanding.

At this point, truncating the N=3 curvature definitions (see Eq.s (IV.7.46) and (IV.7.48) of Ref. [17]), we obtain the N=2 curvature definitions already adapted to the minimal coupling.

$$\begin{aligned} R^a &= dV^a - \omega^{ab} \wedge V_b - i\bar{\psi}_A \gamma^a \wedge \psi^A \equiv \mathcal{D}V^a - i\bar{\psi}_A \wedge \gamma^a \psi^A, \\ R^{ab} &= d\omega^{ab} - \omega^{ac} \wedge \omega_c{}^b, \\ \rho_A &= d\psi_A - \frac{1}{4}\omega^{ab}\gamma_{ab} \wedge \psi_A + \frac{i}{2} Q \wedge \psi_A = \mathcal{D}\psi_A + \frac{i}{2} Q \wedge \psi_A \equiv \nabla \psi_A, \\ \rho^A &= d\psi^A - \frac{1}{4}\omega^{ab}\gamma_{ab} \wedge \psi^A - \frac{i}{2} Q \wedge \psi^A = \mathcal{D}\psi^A - \frac{i}{2} Q \wedge \psi^A \equiv \nabla \psi^A, \\ F_\Lambda &= dA_\Lambda + f_\Lambda{}^{\Omega\Delta} A_\Omega \wedge A_\Delta + \epsilon_{AB} L_\Lambda \bar{\psi}^A \wedge \psi^B + \epsilon^{AB} \bar{L}_\Lambda \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \psi_B, \\ \nabla \lambda_{iA} &= d\lambda_{iA} - \frac{1}{4}\omega^{ab} \wedge \gamma_{ab}\lambda_{iA} + \frac{i}{2}\left(1 + \frac{2}{n}\right) Q \lambda_{iA} + Q_i{}^j \lambda_{jA}, \\ \nabla \lambda^{iA} &= d\lambda^{iA} - \frac{1}{4}\omega^{ab} \wedge \gamma_{ab}\lambda^{iA} - \frac{i}{2}\left(1 + \frac{2}{n}\right) Q \lambda^{iA} + Q^i{}_j \lambda^{jA}, \\ \nabla z_i &= dz_i + g A_\Lambda k_i^\Lambda(z), \\ \nabla \bar{z}^i &= d\bar{z}^i + g A_\Lambda k^{i\Lambda}(\bar{z}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where $\gamma_{ab} = \frac{1}{2}[\gamma_a, \gamma_b]$ and $Q^i{}_j = (Q_i{}^j)^*$. $k_{\Lambda i}(z)$ and $k_\Lambda^i(\bar{z})$ are respectively the holomorphic and antiholomorphic Killing vectors generating the special Kähler manifold isometries. The

explicit expression of these Killing vectors can be read from Eq.s (3.5) and (3.6), isolating the term proportional to A_Λ in the definition of $P_i = (g^{\frac{1}{2}})_i{}^j(dz_j + gA_\Lambda k_j^\Lambda(z))$. One finds $k_i^\Lambda(z) = f_i{}^{\Lambda k} z_k$ in the case in which only the matter vectors are gauged (this point will be justified in the following section). In the N=2 notation it is useful to introduce the new definitions

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_i^A &= -\epsilon^{AB}(g^{-\frac{1}{2}})_i{}^j\lambda_{jB},\\ \lambda_A^i &= -\epsilon_{AB}(g^{-\frac{1}{2}})_j{}^i\lambda^{jB}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Since z and $\bar{z}$ will be shown to have opposite R-duality charges, the matrix $g^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is R-duality invariant and so the above definitions do not change the R-duality transformation properties of the fermions. Formulae (3.8) are determined in such a way as to match the following rheonomic parametrizations

$$\begin{aligned}P_i &= P_{i|a}V^a + \epsilon^{AB}\bar{\lambda}_{iA}\psi_B,\\ \nabla z_i &= Z_{i|a}V^a + \bar{\lambda}_i^A\psi_A,\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

that appear in the N=3 and N=2 formulations, respectively. In the N=2 notation the gaugino curvatures are

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla\lambda_i^A &= \mathcal{D}\lambda_i^A - \frac{i}{2}Q\lambda_i^A - \Gamma_i{}^j\lambda_j^A,\\ \nabla\lambda_A^i &= \mathcal{D}\lambda_A^i + \frac{i}{2}Q\lambda_A^i - \Gamma^i{}_j\lambda_A^j,\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where $\Gamma_i{}^j = -(g^{-1})_i{}^l(\partial^j g_l{}^k)\nabla z_k - gA_\Lambda\partial^j k_i^\Lambda$ is the gauged Levi-Civita holomorphic connection on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\Gamma^i{}_j = (\Gamma_i{}^j)^*$.

In the variables λ_{iA}, P_i inherited from the N=3 truncation, the standard N=2 Bianchi identities (see Eq.s (3.35) of Ref. [16]) take the following form

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{D}R^a + R^{ab}\wedge V_b + i\bar{\rho}^A\wedge\gamma^a\psi_A - i\bar{\psi}^A\wedge\gamma^a\rho_A = 0,\\ &\mathcal{D}R^{ab} = 0,\\ &\nabla\rho_A + \frac{1}{4}R^{ab}\wedge\gamma_{ab}\psi_A - \frac{i}{2}K\wedge\psi_A = 0,\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\nabla\rho^A + \frac{1}{4}R^{ab}\wedge\gamma_{ab}\psi^A + \frac{i}{2}K\wedge\psi^A = 0,\\
&\nabla F_\Lambda - f^i_\Lambda\nabla z_i\epsilon_{AB}\bar\psi^A\wedge\psi^B - \bar f_{\Lambda i}\nabla\bar z^i\epsilon^{AB}\bar\psi_A\wedge\psi_B +\\
&\qquad + 2L_\Lambda\epsilon_{AB}\bar\psi^A\wedge\rho^B + 2\bar L_\Lambda\epsilon^{AB}\bar\psi_A\wedge\rho_B = 0,\\
&\nabla^2\lambda_{iA} + \frac{1}{4}R^{ab}\wedge\gamma_{ab}\lambda_{iA} - R_i{}^j\lambda_{jA} - \frac{i}{2}\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)K\lambda_{iA} = 0,\\
&\nabla^2\lambda^{iA} + \frac{1}{4}R^{ab}\wedge\gamma_{ab}\lambda^{iA} - R^i{}_j\lambda^{jA} + \frac{i}{2}\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)K\lambda^{iA} = 0,\\
&\nabla P_i = dP_i + Q_i{}^j\wedge P_j + i\left(1+\frac{1}{n}\right)Q\wedge P_i = 0,\\
&\nabla P_i = dP^i + Q^i{}_j\wedge P^j - i\left(1+\frac{1}{n}\right)Q\wedge P^i = 0,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.11}
$$

where $K = dQ$, $R_i{}^j = dQ_i{}^j + Q_i{}^k\wedge Q_k{}^j$ and $R^i{}_j = (R_i{}^j)^*$. The rheonomic parametrizations are

$$
\begin{aligned}
R^a &= 0,\\
R^{ab} &= R^{ab}{}_{cd}V^c\wedge V^d - i\bar\psi_A(2\gamma^{[a}\rho^{A|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho^{A|ab})\wedge V_c +\\
&\quad - i\bar\psi^A(2\gamma^{[a}\rho_A{}^{|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho_A{}^{|ab})\wedge V_c + 2G^{-ab}\epsilon^{AB}\bar\psi_A\wedge\psi_B +\\
&\quad + 2G^{+ab}\epsilon_{AB}\bar\psi^A\wedge\psi^B + \frac{i}{4}\varepsilon^{abcd}\bar\psi_A\wedge\gamma_c\psi^B(2\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma_d\lambda^{iA} - \delta^A_B\bar\lambda_{iC}\gamma_d\lambda^{iC}),\\
\rho_A &= \rho_{A|ab}V^a\wedge V^b - 2i\epsilon_{AB}G^+_{ab}\gamma^a\psi^B\wedge V^b + \frac{i}{4}\psi_B\bar\lambda^{iB}\gamma^a\lambda_{iA}\wedge V_a +\\
&\quad + \frac{i}{8}\gamma_{ab}\psi_B\left(2\bar\lambda^{iB}\gamma^a\lambda_{iA} - \delta^B_A\bar\lambda^{iC}\gamma^a\lambda_{iC}\right)\wedge V^b,\\
\rho^A &= \rho^A_{ab}V^a\wedge V^b - 2i\epsilon^{AB}G^-_{ab}\gamma^a\psi_B\wedge V^b + \frac{i}{4}\psi^B\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma^a\lambda^{iA}\wedge V_a +\\
&\quad + \frac{i}{8}\gamma_{ab}\psi^B\left(2\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma^a\lambda^{iA} - \delta^A_B\bar\lambda_{iC}\gamma^a\lambda^{iC}\right)\wedge V^b,\\
F_\Lambda &= F^{ab}_\Lambda V_a\wedge V_b + i(f^i_\Lambda\bar\lambda^A_i\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{\Lambda i}\bar\lambda^i_A\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_a,\\
\nabla\lambda_{iA} &= \nabla_a\lambda_{iA}V^a + iP_{i|a}\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB} + G^{+ab}_i\gamma_{ab}\psi_A + gC_i\psi_A,\\
\nabla\lambda^{iA} &= \nabla_a\lambda^{iA}V^a + iP^i_{|a}\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB} + G^{-i}_{ab}\gamma^{ab}\psi^A + gC^i\psi^A,\\
\nabla z_i &= Z_{i|a}V^a + \bar\lambda^A_i\psi_A,\\
\nabla\bar z^i &= \bar Z^i_{|a}V^a + \bar\lambda^i_A\psi^A.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.12}
$$

where $C^i = (L^{-1})_3{}^k L_j{}^i L_l{}^3 f_k{}^{jl}$ are obtained from the N=2 truncation as particular instances of the N=3 boosted structure constants, $C_i = (C^i)^*$, $\bar f_{\Lambda i} = (f^i_\Lambda)^*$. G^{+ab}, G^{+ab}_i, G^-_{ab} and G^{-i}_{ab}

are determined by the equation

$$\frac{1}{2}F^{ab}_{\Lambda} + L_{\Lambda}{}^{3}G^{-ab} + L_{\Lambda}{}^{i}G^{+ab}_{i} + (L^{-1})_{3}{}^{\Pi}J_{\Pi\Lambda}G^{+ab} - (L^{-1})_{i}{}^{\Pi}J_{\Pi\Lambda}G^{i-ab} = 0, \tag{3.13}$$

where $J_{\Lambda\Pi}$ is the $SU(1,n)$-invariant metric

$$J_{\Lambda\Pi} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\delta_{ij} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.14}$$

One finds

$$\begin{aligned} G^{+ab} &= -\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{a}(1+2\bar{\mathcal{N}})^{0\Lambda}F^{+ab}_{\Lambda}, \\ G^{+ab}_{i} &= -\frac{1}{4}\sqrt{a}(g^{\frac{1}{2}})_{i}{}^{j}(1+2\bar{\mathcal{N}})_{j}{}^{\Lambda}F^{+ab}_{\Lambda} + \frac{1}{a}\bar{z}^{2}z_{i}G^{+ab} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{a}}z_{i}\bar{z}^{k}F^{+ab}_{k}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

and $G^{-}_{ab} = (G^{+}_{ab})^{*}$ and $G^{-i}_{ab} = (G_{iab}{}^{+})^{*}$. The rheonomic parametrizations are on-shell consistent with the Bianchi identities (3.11).

We can now write down the lagrangian of N=2 supergravity minimally coupled to n vector multiplets.

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{kin} + \mathcal{L}_{Pauli} + \mathcal{L}_{torsion} + \mathcal{L}_{4Fermi} + \Delta\mathcal{L}_{gauging} + \Delta\mathcal{L}_{potential}, \tag{3.16}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{kin} &= \varepsilon_{abcd}R^{ab}\wedge V^{c}\wedge V^{d} - 4(\bar{\psi}^{A}\wedge\gamma_{a}\rho_{A} + \bar{\rho}^{A}\wedge\gamma_{a}\psi_{A})\wedge V^{a} + \\ &- \frac{i}{3}g_{i}{}^{j}(\bar{\lambda}^{A}_{j}\gamma_{a}\nabla\lambda^{i}_{A} + \bar{\lambda}^{i}_{A}\gamma_{a}\nabla\lambda^{A}_{j})\wedge V_{b}\wedge V_{c}\wedge V_{d}\varepsilon^{abcd} + \\ &+ \frac{2}{3}g_{i}{}^{j}[\bar{Z}^{i}_{|a}(\nabla z_{j} - \bar{\lambda}^{A}_{j}\psi_{A}) + Z_{j|a}(\nabla\bar{z}^{i} - \bar{\lambda}^{i}_{A}\psi^{A})]\wedge V_{b}\wedge V_{c}\wedge V_{d}\varepsilon^{abcd} + \\ &+ \frac{1}{6}(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F^{+ab}_{\Lambda}F^{+}_{\Sigma ab} + \mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F^{-ab}_{\Lambda}F^{-}_{\Sigma ab} - g_{i}{}^{j}\bar{Z}^{i}_{|a}Z_{j|}{}^{a})\varepsilon_{cdef}V^{c}\wedge V^{d}\wedge V^{e}\wedge V^{f} + \\ &- 4i(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F^{+ab}_{\Lambda} - \mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F^{-ab}_{\Lambda})\wedge(F_{\Sigma} + \\ &- i(f^{i}_{\Sigma}\bar{\lambda}^{A}_{i}\gamma^{c}\psi^{B}\epsilon_{AB} + \bar{f}_{\Sigma i}\bar{\lambda}^{i}_{A}\gamma^{c}\psi_{B}\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_{c})\wedge V_{a}\wedge V_{b}, \\ \mathcal{L}_{Pauli} &= -4iF_{\Lambda}\wedge(\mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}L_{\Sigma}\epsilon_{AB}\bar{\psi}^{A}\wedge\psi^{B} - \bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}\bar{L}_{\Sigma}\epsilon^{AB}\bar{\psi}_{A}\wedge\psi_{B}) + \\ &+ 4F_{\Lambda}\wedge(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}f^{i}_{\Sigma}\bar{\lambda}^{A}_{i}\gamma_{a}\psi^{B}\epsilon_{AB} - \mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}\bar{f}_{\Sigma i}\bar{\lambda}^{i}_{A}\gamma_{a}\psi_{B}\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V^{a} + \\ &- 2ig_{i}{}^{j}(\nabla z_{j}\wedge\bar{\lambda}^{i}_{A}\gamma_{ab}\psi^{A} - \nabla\bar{z}^{i}\wedge\bar{\lambda}^{A}_{j}\gamma_{ab}\psi_{A})\wedge V^{a}\wedge V^{b}, \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{torsion} &= R^a \wedge V_a \wedge g_i{}^j \bar{\lambda}^i_A \gamma_b \lambda^A_j \wedge V^b, \\
\mathcal{L}_{4Fermi} &= i(W \epsilon_{AB} \bar{\psi}^A \wedge \psi^B \wedge \epsilon_{CD} \bar{\psi}^C \wedge \psi^D - \bar{W} \epsilon^{AB} \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \psi_B \wedge \epsilon^{CD} \bar{\psi}_C \wedge \psi_D) + \\
&- 2i g_i{}^j \bar{\lambda}^i_A \gamma_a \lambda^B_j \bar{\psi}_B \wedge \gamma_b \psi^A \wedge V^a \wedge V^b + \\
&+ i(W_{ij} \epsilon^{AB} \bar{\lambda}^i_A \gamma_a \psi_B \wedge V^a \wedge \epsilon^{CD} \bar{\lambda}^j_C \gamma_b \psi_D \wedge V^b + \\
&- W^{ij} \epsilon_{AB} \bar{\lambda}^A_i \gamma_a \psi^B \wedge V^a \wedge \epsilon_{CD} \bar{\lambda}^C_j \gamma_b \psi^D \wedge V^b) + \\
&+ \frac{1}{18} \epsilon_{abcd} V^a \wedge V^b \wedge V^c \wedge V^d g_i{}^j \bar{\lambda}^i_A \gamma^m \lambda^A_j g_k{}^l \bar{\lambda}^k_B \gamma_m \lambda^B_l, \\
\Delta\mathcal{L}_{gauging} &= \frac{2i}{3} g(\bar{\lambda}^A_i \gamma^a \psi^B W^i_{AB} + \bar{\lambda}^i_A \gamma^a \psi_B W^{AB}_i) \wedge V^b \wedge V^c \wedge V^d \varepsilon_{abcd} + \\
&+ \frac{1}{6} g(M^{ij} \bar{\lambda}^A_i \lambda^B_j \epsilon_{AB} + M_{ij} \bar{\lambda}^i_A \lambda^j_B \epsilon^{AB}) \varepsilon_{abcd} V^a \wedge V^b \wedge V^c \wedge V^d, \\
\Delta\mathcal{L}_{potential} &= -\frac{1}{12} g^2 g_i{}^j W^i_{AB} W^{AB}_j \varepsilon_{abcd} V^a \wedge V^b \wedge V^c \wedge V^d,
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.17}
$$

where $W = 2L_\Lambda L_\Sigma \mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}$, $W^{ij} = 2\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma} f^i_\Lambda f^j_\Sigma$ and $W_{ij} = (W^{ij})^*$, while $M^{ij} = k^{l\Lambda} f^{[i}_\Lambda g_l{}^{j]}$ and $M_{ij} = (M^{ij})^*$, $W^i_{AB} = \epsilon_{AB} k^{i\Lambda} L_\Lambda$, $W^{AB}_i = (W^i_{AB})^*$. The lagrangian in Eq.s (3.16) and (3.17) agrees with the lagrangian (4.13) of Ref. [16] upon suppression of the hypermultiplets and up to $\mathcal{L}_{4Fermi}$ and the second term of $\Delta\mathcal{L}_{gauging}$, that were not calculated in [16]. Indeed, the very reason why we have performed the above described N=2 truncation of the N=3 theory was that of obtaining these terms without calculating them explicitly. Our purpose is that of checking R-duality in the minimal coupling, however, as a byproduct, we have also obtained the complete form of the lagrangian of N=2 supergravity coupled to vector multiplets for an arbitrary choice of the special Kähler manifold. All the objects entering (3.17) have already been interpreted in a general N=2 setup (in which the graviphoton can be gauged). As a matter of fact, the N=3 theory does not admit the most general gauging of the vectors [17,18], but it surely admits any gauging of the matter vectors. Even if the minimal N=2 theory exists in any case, the truncation from N=3 can only give the minimal N=2 theory in which the graviphoton is not gauged.

As promised, in the following section we define R-duality and prove that it is indeed an on-shell symmetry of the above theory.

IV. R-DUALITY FOR N=2 MATTER COUPLED SUPERGRAVITY

Now, starting form the R-duality transformation properties of the fermions, as derived in Section II, we determine the transformations of the bosons by simply requiring $[\hat{\delta}, \delta_\varepsilon] = 0$ on-shell, if δ_ε is the supersymmetry transformation with parameters ε (let ε_A and ε^A be the left and right handed components, respectively). The supersymmetry transformations can be read in the usual way from the rheonomic parametrizations (3.9) and (3.12). In any case, their explicit expression will be written down later on in the context of the BRST-quantization of the theory (see formula (5.2)). So, we start from

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{\delta}\psi_A = \psi_A, \qquad \hat{\delta}\varepsilon_A = \varepsilon_A, \qquad \hat{\delta}\lambda_i^A = \lambda_i^A, \\ &\hat{\delta}\psi^A = -\psi^A, \quad \hat{\delta}\varepsilon^A = -\varepsilon^A, \quad \hat{\delta}\lambda_A^i = -\lambda_A^i. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

First of all, consistency of R-duality with supersymmetry states that, if a field ϕ has an R-duality charge equal to q, then $\delta_\varepsilon\phi$ has the same charge q and viceversa. It is immediate to see that $\hat{\delta}\delta_\varepsilon V^a = 0$ and so we deduce $\hat{\delta}V^a = 0$. This is good, because in our mind, R-duality is to become ghost number and the vierbein should remain of zero ghost number together with all the matter vectors. Similarly, $\hat{\delta}\delta_\varepsilon z_i = 2\delta_\varepsilon z_i$, requiring $\hat{\delta}z_i = 2z_i$. An analogous reasoning gives, when applied to $\bar{z}^i$, $\hat{\delta}\bar{z}^i = -2\bar{z}^i$, thus confirming that z_i and $\bar{z}^i$ have opposite charges. This immediately rules out the possibility that the $U(1)$ symmetry we are looking for might be a subgroup of the group of duality transformations [11,17]. Indeed, in that case z_i and $\bar{z}^i$ would have the same charge. This is welcome, because, if $U(1)_I$ were a subgroup of the duality group, we could not maintain the symmetry in the presence of gauging, as, on the contrary, we expect to be able to do. We immediately see that the Kähler potential G is invariant, as well as the metric $g_i{}^j$ (note that this fact would not hold true in the nonminimal case). It remains to find the transformation properties of the vector bosons. Let us concentrate on the ungauged case ($g = 0$) for the moment. One can verify that $[\hat{\delta}, \delta_\varepsilon]\psi_A = 0$ and $[\hat{\delta}, \delta_\varepsilon]\psi^A = 0$ imply

$$\hat{\delta}G^{\pm ab} = \pm 2G^{\pm ab}, \tag{4.2}$$

while $[\hat{\delta}, \delta_\varepsilon]\lambda_i^A = 0$ and $[\hat{\delta}, \delta_\varepsilon]\lambda_A^i = 0$ imply

$$\hat{\delta}G_i^{+ab} = 0, \quad \hat{\delta}G^{i-ab} = 0\,. \tag{4.3}$$

respectively. Equations (4.2) and (4.3) form a linear system of equations in $\hat{\delta}F_\Lambda^{\pm ab}$, in which the number of unknowns equals the number of equations. The unique solution is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}F^{0+ab} &= 4\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{0\Lambda}F_\Lambda^{+ab}, \qquad \hat{\delta}F_i^{+ab} = 0, \\ \hat{\delta}F^{0-ab} &= -4\mathcal{N}^{0\Lambda}F_\Lambda^{-ab}, \quad \hat{\delta}F^{i-ab} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

The graviphoton is thus transformed in a way that resembles the duality transformations and this forbids its gauging it if we want R-duality. Consequently, when considering the gauged case, we must assume that only the matter vectors are gauged, i. e. $f_\Lambda^{\Sigma\Omega} = 0$ whenever one of the indices Λ, Σ, Ω takes the value zero. There is no restriction, on the contrary, on the gauge group of the matter vectors.

Let us rewrite the rheonomic parametrization of the vectors and the definition of their curvatures

$$\begin{aligned} F_\Lambda &= F_\Lambda^{ab}V_a \wedge V_b + i(f_\Lambda^i \bar{\lambda}_i^A \gamma^a \psi^B \epsilon_{AB} + \bar{f}_{\Lambda i}\bar{\lambda}_A^i \gamma^a \psi_B \epsilon^{AB}) \wedge V_a, \\ F_\Lambda &= dA_\Lambda + f_\Lambda{}^{\Omega\Delta}A_\Omega \wedge A_\Delta + \epsilon_{AB}L_\Lambda \bar{\psi}^A \wedge \psi^B + \epsilon^{AB}\bar{L}_\Lambda \bar{\psi}_A \wedge \psi_B. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

These expressions show that, under the above conditions on the structure constants $f_\Lambda^{\Sigma\Omega}$, the transformations $\hat{\delta}F_i^{+ab} = 0$ and $\hat{\delta}F^{i-ab} = 0$ imply $\hat{\delta}A_i = 0$, i. e. all the matter vectors are inert under R-duality (they will have ghost number zero after the twist and this is good in order to recover topological Yang-Mills theory).

Summarizing, R-duality acts on-shell as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}V^a &= 0, \\ \hat{\delta}\psi_A = \psi_A, &\qquad \hat{\delta}\psi^A = -\psi^A, \\ \hat{\delta}F^{0+ab} = 4\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{0\Lambda}F_\Lambda^{+ab}, &\quad \hat{\delta}F^{0-ab} = -4\mathcal{N}^{0\Lambda}F_\Lambda^{-ab}, \\ \\ \hat{\delta}A_i &= 0 \\ \hat{\delta}\lambda_i^A = \lambda_i^A, &\quad \hat{\delta}\lambda_A^i = -\lambda_A^i, \\ \hat{\delta}z_i = 2z_i, &\quad \hat{\delta}\bar{z}^i = -2\bar{z}^i. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

One easily checks that formulas (4.2), (4.3), (4.4) and (4.6) are still valid when all the vectors but the graviphoton are gauged.

What about $\hat{\delta}A_0$? As in all duality-type transformations, $\hat{\delta}A_0$ should be meaningful only on-shell (see Section II). In fact, (4.4) and (4.5) imply (using the explicit expressions (3.2))

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\delta}F_0^{ab}V_a\wedge V_b &= 4(\bar{\mathcal{N}}_0^{\Lambda}F_{\Lambda}^{+ab}-\mathcal{N}_0{}^{\Lambda}F_{\Lambda}^{-ab})V_a\wedge V_b = \\ &= \hat{\delta}[dA_0+\epsilon_{AB}L_0\bar{\psi}^A\wedge\psi^B+\epsilon^{AB}\bar{L}_0\bar{\psi}_A\wedge\psi_B+ \\ &- i(f_0^i\bar{\lambda}_i^A\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB}+\bar{f}_{0i}\bar{\lambda}_A^i\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_a] = \\ &= d\hat{\delta}A_0-4\mathcal{N}_0{}^{\Lambda}L_{\Lambda}\epsilon_{AB}\bar{\psi}^A\wedge\psi^B+4\bar{\mathcal{N}}_0^{\Lambda}\bar{L}_{\Lambda}\epsilon^{AB}\bar{\psi}_A\wedge\psi_B+ \\ &- 4i(\bar{\mathcal{N}}_0^{\Lambda}f_{\Lambda}^i\bar{\lambda}_i^A\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB}-\mathcal{N}_0{}^{\Lambda}\bar{f}_{\Lambda i}\bar{\lambda}_A^i\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_a. \end{aligned}\tag{4.7}$$

Imposing $d^2\hat{\delta}A_0=0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}d[(\bar{\mathcal{N}}_0^{\Lambda}F_{\Lambda}^{+ab}-\mathcal{N}_0{}^{\Lambda}F_{\Lambda}^{-ab})V_a\wedge V_b+\mathcal{N}_0{}^{\Lambda}L_{\Lambda}\epsilon_{AB}\bar{\psi}^A\wedge\psi^B-\bar{\mathcal{N}}_0^{\Lambda}\bar{L}_{\Lambda}\epsilon^{AB}\bar{\psi}_A\wedge\psi_B+ \\ +i(\bar{\mathcal{N}}_0^{\Lambda}f_{\Lambda}^i\bar{\lambda}_i^A\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB}-\mathcal{N}_0{}^{\Lambda}\bar{f}_{\Lambda i}\bar{\lambda}_A^i\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_a]=0.\end{aligned}\tag{4.8}$$

One can easily verify that this is the equation of motion of the graviphoton as derived from the lagrangian (3.16). Furthermore, the R-duality variation of the A_0 equation of motion is proportional to the A_0-Bianchi identity and viceversa. It is easily checked that the other curvatures of (3.7) and the remaining Bianchi identities of (3.11) transform correctly, so the last step in order to establish R-duality of the theory is the proof of invariance for the remaining field equations.

The equations of motion of the vector bosons can be written in the following form

$$dS^{\Lambda}+2f_{\Delta}^{\Lambda\Sigma}A_{\Sigma}\wedge S^{\Delta}+R^{\Lambda}=0,\tag{4.9}$$

where S^{Λ} is, by definition, the coefficient in the lagrangian of the field strength F_{Λ}, namely

$$\begin{aligned}S^{\Lambda}=(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F_{\Sigma}^{+ab}-\mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F_{\Sigma}^{-ab})V_a\wedge V_b+\mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}L_{\Sigma}\epsilon_{AB}\bar{\psi}^A\wedge\psi^B-\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}\bar{L}_{\Sigma}\epsilon^{AB}\bar{\psi}_A\wedge\psi_B+ \\ +i(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}f_{\Sigma}^i\bar{\lambda}_i^A\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB}-\mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}\bar{f}_{\Sigma i}\bar{\lambda}_A^i\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_a,\end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

and R^{Λ} is the remainder that comes from the $\frac{\delta}{\delta A_{\Lambda}}$-variation of those terms that are manifestly R-duality invariant and do not depend on the graviphoton A_0. Since one can easily verify

that $\hat{\delta}S^{\Lambda}$ vanishes whenever $\Lambda \neq 0$ (to this purpose, note that $\hat{\delta}(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{i\Sigma}F_{\Sigma}^{+ab}) = \hat{\delta}(\mathcal{N}^{i\Sigma}F_{\Sigma}^{-ab}) = 0$ and use the explicit expressions (3.2)), then the field equations of the matter vectors are all R-duality invariant.

In order to prove R-duality invariance of the remaining field equations, we note that it is not necessary to study the entire lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (3.16), because various terms can give only contributions with the correct $\hat{\delta}$-transformation properties. These are precisely the R-duality invariant terms of $\mathcal{L}$ that do not depend on A_0. On the other hand, since $\hat{\delta}F_0^{ab}$ depends on all the fields, we cannot neglect a term $\Delta\mathcal{L}$ only because it is $\hat{\delta}$-invariant ($\hat{\delta}\Delta\mathcal{L} = 0$) if it contains A_0. Indeed, if ϕ is a field of charge q ($\hat{\delta}\phi = q\phi$; we can take $\phi \neq A_0$ since the A_0-equation has already been studied), then the contributions to its field equation (i. e. $\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\Delta\mathcal{L}$) must have charge $-q$ in order to transform correctly ($\hat{\delta}\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\Delta\mathcal{L} = -q\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\Delta\mathcal{L}$) and it must happen that

$$\left[\hat{\delta}, \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\right]\Delta\mathcal{L} = -q\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\Delta\mathcal{L}. \tag{4.11}$$

For this to be true it is sufficient (and necessary, if $\Delta\mathcal{L}$ has not a special form) to have

$$\left[\hat{\delta}, \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\right]\phi' = -q\frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}\phi', \tag{4.12}$$

for all fields ϕ'. However, this is not true for $\phi' = F_0^{ab}$ and so, if $\Delta\mathcal{L}$ depends on A_0 one should analyze it explicitly. Summarizing, it is sufficient to test R-duality invariance of the contributions to the field equations that come from the terms of the lagrangian either containing A_0 or not $\hat{\delta}$-invariant. This part of the lagrangian is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta\mathcal{L} \equiv\ & \frac{1}{6}(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F_{\Lambda}^{+ab}F_{\Sigma ab}^{+} + \mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F_{\Lambda}^{-ab}F_{\Sigma ab}^{-})\varepsilon_{cdef}V^c \wedge V^d \wedge V^e \wedge V^f + \\
& - 4i(\bar{\mathcal{N}}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F_{\Lambda}^{+ab} - \mathcal{N}^{\Lambda\Sigma}F_{\Lambda}^{-ab}) \wedge V_a \wedge V_b \wedge (F_{\Sigma} + \\
& - i(f_{\Sigma}^{i}\bar{\lambda}_i^A\gamma^c\psi^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar{f}_{\Sigma i}\bar{\lambda}_A^i\gamma^c\psi_B\epsilon^{AB}) \wedge V_c), \\
& - 2i\frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}F^0 \wedge (\epsilon_{AB}\bar{\psi}^A \wedge \psi^B - \epsilon^{AB}\bar{\psi}_A \wedge \psi_B) + \\
& - \frac{2}{a\sqrt{a}}F^0 \wedge (\bar{z}^i\bar{\lambda}_i^A\gamma_a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB} - z_i\bar{\lambda}_A^i\gamma_a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB}) \wedge V^a + \\
& + \frac{i}{a}(\epsilon_{AB}\bar{\psi}^A \wedge \psi^B \wedge \epsilon_{CD}\bar{\psi}^C \wedge \psi^D - \epsilon^{AB}\bar{\psi}_A \wedge \psi_B \wedge \epsilon^{CD}\bar{\psi}_C \wedge \psi_D) +
\end{aligned}$$

$$- \frac{i}{a^3}(z_i z_j \epsilon^{AB} \bar{\lambda}^i_A \gamma_a \psi_B \wedge V^a \wedge \epsilon^{CD} \bar{\lambda}^j_C \gamma_b \psi_D \wedge V^b +$$
$$- \bar{z}^i \bar{z}^j \epsilon_{AB} \bar{\lambda}^A_i \gamma_a \psi^B \wedge V^a \wedge \epsilon_{CD} \bar{\lambda}^C_j \gamma_b \psi^D \wedge V^b), \tag{4.13}$$

where W and W^{ij} have been replaced by their explicit expressions in terms of z_i, and $\bar{z}^i$ and, after replacement, the manifestly $\hat{\delta}$-invariant terms not containing A_0 have been deleted. At this point, the check that the contributions to the field equations of the fermions, the vierbein and the scalars transform correctly is rather direct and we leave it to the reader. We thus conclude that

Proposition. *N=2 supergravity minimally coupled to n vector multiplets gauging an arbitrary n dimensional group (in which the graviphoton is not gauged), is on-shell R-duality invariant*[1].

The possibility that R-duality exists also in the N=3 theory or in more extended supergravity theories as well as the possibility to have it in N=2 matter coupled supergravity in nonminimal cases (even if, we presume, it might not be suitable for a topological twist) remain open problems. Here we have restricted our attention to that internal $U(1)$ symmetry that was relevant to our purposes, that is the topological twist.

We have so far neglected the coupling of matter hypermultiplets to N=2 supergravity, since it is immediately verified that the generalization of R-duality due to the presence of them is trivial. The scalars have 0 charge, however the left handed components of fermions must have -1 charge and the right handed components must have $+1$ charge, differently from the case of the other fermions so far encountered. The twist is by no means trivial. As a matter of fact, it turns out that it is interesting as we shall see at the end of this paper.

---

[1]Note that for an N=2 theory without hypermultiplets, the statement that a certain vector is not gauged is equivalent to the statement that it corresponds to a $U(1)$ subgroup of the full gauge group.

V. TOPOLOGICAL TWIST OF THE MINIMAL THEORY

In this section, we discuss the twisted topological theory. First of all, let us note that the gauge-free algebra (i. e. the minimal BRST algebra, with neither antighosts nor gauge-fixings, nor Lagrange multipliers) is simply the tensor product of the gauge-free algebras for topological gravity and topological Yang-Mills [10], that is to say

$$
\begin{aligned}
sA &= -\nabla c - \psi, \\
sc &= \phi - \frac{1}{2}\,[c,c]\,, \\
s\psi &= \nabla\phi - [c,\psi]\,, \\
s\phi &= -\,[c,\phi]\,, \\
sV^a &= \psi^a - \mathcal{D}_0\varepsilon^a + \varepsilon^{ab}\wedge V_b, \\
s\omega_0^{ab} &= \chi^{ab} - \mathcal{D}_0\varepsilon^{ab}, \\
s\varepsilon^a &= \phi^a + \varepsilon^{ab}\wedge\varepsilon_b, \\
s\varepsilon^{ab} &= \eta^{ab} + \varepsilon^a{}_c\wedge\varepsilon^{cb}, \\
s\psi^a &= -\mathcal{D}_0\phi^a + \varepsilon^{ab}\wedge\psi_b - \chi^{ab}\wedge\varepsilon_b - \eta^{ab}\wedge V_b, \\
s\phi^a &= \varepsilon^{ab}\wedge\phi_b - \eta^{ab}\wedge\varepsilon_b, \\
s\chi^{ab} &= -\mathcal{D}_0\eta^{ab} + \varepsilon^{ac}\wedge\chi_c{}^b - \chi^{ac}\wedge\varepsilon_c{}^b, \\
s\eta^{ab} &= \varepsilon^{ac}\wedge\eta_c{}^b - \eta^{ac}\wedge\varepsilon_c{}^b.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.1}
$$

We have grouped the n matter vectors A_i into the column $A = (A_i)$. Similarly, $\psi = (\psi_i)$, $\phi = (\phi_i)$ and $c = (c_i)$. For the definitions of the other symbols, refer to Ref. [10].

The observables and the corresponding descent equations can be derived from the hatted extensions of the identities $d\,\mathrm{tr}[F\wedge F] = 0$, $d\,\mathrm{tr}[R\wedge R] = 0$ and $d\,\mathrm{tr}[R\wedge\tilde{R}] = 0$, in the usual way [10].

The BRST algebra of N=2 matter coupled supergravity can be found as explained in Ref. [10], that is to say by extending all differential forms to ghost forms. We report only the final result, that, together with the translation ghosts ε^a, the Lorentz ghosts ε^{ab}, the

supersymmetry ghosts c_A, c^A, involves also the gauge ghosts c^Λ.

$$
\begin{aligned}
sV^a &= -\mathcal{D}\varepsilon^a + \varepsilon^{ab}\wedge V_b + i(\bar\psi_A\wedge\gamma^a c^A + \bar c_A\wedge\gamma\psi^A),\\
s\varepsilon^a &= \varepsilon^{ab}\wedge\varepsilon_b + i\bar c_A\wedge\gamma^a c^A,\\
s\omega^{ab} &= -\mathcal{D}\varepsilon^{ab} + 2R^{ab}{}_{cd}V^c\varepsilon^d + i(\varepsilon_c\bar\psi_A + V_c\bar c_A)(2\gamma^{[a}\rho^{A|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho^{A|ab}) +\\
&\quad + i(\varepsilon_c\bar\psi^A + V_c\bar c^A)(2\gamma^{[a}\rho_A{}^{|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho_A{}^{|ab}) + 4G^{-ab}\epsilon^{AB}\bar\psi_A\wedge c_B +\\
&\quad + 4G^{+ab}\epsilon_{AB}\bar\psi^A\wedge c^B + \frac{i}{4}\varepsilon^{abcd}(\bar\psi_A\wedge\gamma_c c^B + \bar c_A\wedge\gamma_c\psi^B)(2\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma_d\lambda^{iA} - \delta^A_B\bar\lambda_{iC}\gamma_d\lambda^{iC}),\\
s\varepsilon^{ab} &= \varepsilon^a{}_c\wedge\varepsilon^{cb} + R^{ab}{}_{cd}\varepsilon^c\varepsilon^d - i\bar c_A(2\gamma^{[a}\rho^{A|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho^{A|ab})\varepsilon_c +\\
&\quad - i\bar c^A(2\gamma^{[a}\rho_A{}^{|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho_A{}^{|ab})\varepsilon_c + 2G^{-ab}\epsilon^{AB}\bar c_A\wedge c_B +\\
&\quad + 2G^{+ab}\epsilon_{AB}\bar c^A\wedge c^B + \frac{i}{4}\varepsilon^{abcd}\bar c_A\wedge\gamma_c c^B(2\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma_d\lambda^{iA} - \delta^A_B\bar\lambda_{iC}\gamma_d\lambda^{iC}),\\
s\psi_A &= -\mathcal{D}c_A + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\wedge\psi_A - \frac{i}{2}Q\wedge c_A - \frac{i}{2}Q_{(0,1)}\wedge\psi_A + 2\rho_{A|ab}V^a\wedge\varepsilon^b +\\
&\quad - 2i\epsilon_{AB}G^+_{ab}\gamma^a(c^B\wedge V^b + \psi^B\wedge\varepsilon^b) + \frac{i}{4}(c_B V_a + \psi^B\varepsilon_a)\bar\lambda^{iB}\gamma^a\lambda_{iA} +\\
&\quad + \frac{i}{8}\gamma_{ab}(c_B V^b + \psi_B\varepsilon^b)\left(2\bar\lambda^{iB}\gamma^a\lambda_{iA} - \delta^B_A\bar\lambda^{iC}\gamma^a\lambda_{iC}\right),\\
sc_A &= \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\wedge c_A - \frac{i}{2}Q_{(0,1)}\wedge c_A + \rho_{A|ab}\varepsilon^a\wedge\varepsilon^b - 2i\epsilon_{AB}G^+_{ab}\gamma^a c^B\wedge\varepsilon^b +\\
&\quad + \frac{i}{4}c_B\bar\lambda^{iB}\gamma^a\lambda_{iA}\wedge\varepsilon_a + \frac{i}{8}\gamma_{ab}c_B\left(2\bar\lambda^{iB}\gamma^a\lambda_{iA} - \delta^B_A\bar\lambda^{iC}\gamma^a\lambda_{iC}\right)\wedge\varepsilon^b,\\
s\psi^A &= -\mathcal{D}c^A + \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\wedge\psi^A + \frac{i}{2}Q\wedge c^A + \frac{i}{2}Q_{(0,1)}\wedge\psi^A + 2\rho^A_{|ab}V^a\wedge\varepsilon^b +\\
&\quad - 2i\epsilon^{AB}G^-_{ab}\gamma^a(c_B\wedge V^b + \psi_B\wedge\varepsilon^b) + \frac{i}{4}(c^B V_a + \psi^B\varepsilon_a)\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma^a\lambda^{iA} +\\
&\quad + \frac{i}{8}\gamma_{ab}(c^B V^b + \psi^B\varepsilon^b)\left(2\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma^a\lambda^{iA} - \delta^A_B\bar\lambda_{iC}\gamma^a\lambda^{iC}\right),\\
sc^A &= \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ab}\gamma_{ab}\wedge c^A + \frac{i}{2}Q_{(0,1)}\wedge c^A + \rho^A_{|ab}\varepsilon^a\wedge\varepsilon^b - 2i\epsilon^{AB}G^-_{ab}\gamma^a c_B\wedge\varepsilon^b +\\
&\quad + \frac{i}{4}c^B\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma^a\lambda^{iA}\wedge\varepsilon_a + \frac{i}{8}\gamma_{ab}c^B\left(2\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma^a\lambda^{iA} - \delta^A_B\bar\lambda_{iC}\gamma^a\lambda^{iC}\right)\wedge\varepsilon^b,\\
sA_\Lambda &= -dc_\Lambda - 2f_\Lambda{}^{\Omega\Delta}A_\Omega\wedge c_\Delta - 2\epsilon_{AB}L_\Lambda\bar\psi^A\wedge c^B - 2\epsilon^{AB}\bar L_\Lambda\bar\psi_A\wedge c_B +\\
&\quad + 2F^{ab}_\Lambda V_a\wedge\varepsilon_b + i(f^i_\Lambda\bar\lambda^A_i\gamma^a c^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{\Lambda i}\bar\lambda^i_A\gamma^a c_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_a +\\
&\quad + i(f^i_\Lambda\bar\lambda^A_i\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{\Lambda i}\bar\lambda^i_A\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge\varepsilon_a,\\
sc_\Lambda &= -f_\Lambda{}^{\Omega\Delta}c_\Omega\wedge c_\Delta - \epsilon_{AB}L_\Lambda\bar c^A\wedge c^B - \epsilon^{AB}\bar L_\Lambda\bar c_A\wedge c_B + F^{ab}_\Lambda\varepsilon_a\wedge\varepsilon_b +\\
&\quad + i(f^i_\Lambda\bar\lambda^A_i\gamma^a c^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{\Lambda i}\bar\lambda^i_A\gamma^a c_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge\varepsilon_a,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
s\lambda_{iA} &= \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ab}\wedge\gamma_{ab}\lambda_{iA} - \frac{i}{2}\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)Q_{(0,1)}\wedge\lambda_{iA} - Q_{(0,1)_i}{}^j\lambda_{jA} + \nabla_a\lambda_{iA}\varepsilon^a + \\
&\quad + iP_{i|a}\gamma^a c^B\epsilon_{AB} + G_i^{+ab}\gamma_{ab}c_A + gC_i c_A, \\
s\lambda^{iA} &= \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon^{ab}\wedge\gamma_{ab}\lambda^{iA} + \frac{i}{2}\left(1+\frac{2}{n}\right)Q_{(0,1)}\wedge\lambda^{iA} - Q_{(0,1)}{}^i{}_j\lambda^{jA} + \nabla_a\lambda^{iA}\varepsilon^a + \\
&\quad + iP^i_{|a}\gamma^a c_B\epsilon^{AB} + G^{-i}_{ab}\gamma^{ab}c^A + gC^i c^A, \\
sz_i &= -gc_\Lambda k_i^\Lambda(z) + Z_{i|a}\varepsilon^a + \bar\lambda_i^A c_A, \\
s\bar z^i &= -gc_\Lambda k^{i\Lambda}(\bar z) + \bar Z^i_{|a}\varepsilon^a + \bar\lambda^i_A c^A.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.2}
$$

In Eq. (5.2) $Q_{(0,1)}$ and $Q_{(0,1)_i}{}^j$ are obtained by the one-forms Q and $Q_i{}^j$ upon substitution of ∇z_i with $Z_{i|a}\varepsilon^a + \bar\lambda_i^A c_A$, ∇z_i with $\bar Z^i_{|a}\varepsilon^a + \bar\lambda^i_A c^A$ and of A_Λ with c_Λ. In particular, $Q_{(0,1)} = -\frac{i}{2}(G^i Z_{i|a} - G_i\bar Z^i_{|a})\varepsilon^a - \frac{i}{2}(G^i\bar\lambda_i^A c_A - G_i\bar\lambda^i_A c^A)$.

The BRST algebra of the twisted theory is the above algebra when one implements the topological twist and the topological shift, as explained in Ref. [10]. From now on, when we shall refer to the above algebra, this implementation will be understood. The explicit twist is realized as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\psi_{\alpha A}\to\psi_{\alpha\dot A}, \quad \psi^{\dot\alpha A}\to\psi^{\dot\alpha\dot A}, \\
&\lambda_{i\alpha A}\to\lambda_{i\alpha\dot A}, \quad \lambda^{i\dot\alpha A}\to\lambda^{i\dot\alpha\dot A}, \\
&\epsilon_{AB}\to\epsilon_{\dot A\dot B}, \quad \epsilon^{AB}\to-\epsilon^{\dot A\dot B},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.3}
$$

while the topological shift is obtained by

$$
c^{\dot\alpha\dot A}\to -\frac{i}{2}e\varepsilon^{\dot\alpha\dot A} + c^{\dot\alpha\dot A}. \tag{5.4}
$$

Here, e is an object that rearranges the form-number, ghost-number and statistics in the correct way and that appears only in the intermediate steps of the twist. It will be called the *broker*. The broker is a zero-form with fermionic statistics and ghost number one. e^2 has even ghost number and Bose statistics, hance it can be set equal to a number and in our notation we normalize it as $e^2 = 1$.

We now rewrite the most relevant twisted-shifted BRST transformations up to nonlinear terms. To this purpose, note that, when z_i and $\bar z^i$ tend to zero, then $a\to 1$; $L_0, \bar L_0\to 1$;

$f_i{}^j \to \delta_i^j$; $(g^{\frac{1}{2}})_i{}^j \to \delta_i^j$; $G^+_{ab} \to -\frac{1}{2}F^{+0}_{ab}$; $G^{i-}_{ab} \to -\frac{1}{2}F^{i-}_{ab}$. Let us define (note that the gauginos are expressed in the N=3 notation, namely λ_{iA}, λ^{iA})

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\psi}^a &= \tfrac{e}{2}\psi_{\alpha\dot{A}}(\bar{\sigma}^a)^{\dot{A}\alpha}, \quad & \tilde{\psi}^{ab} &= -e(\bar{\sigma}^{ab})^{\dot{A}}{}_{\dot{\alpha}}\psi^{\dot{\alpha}}{}_{\dot{A}}, \quad & \tilde{\psi} &= -e\psi_{\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\dot{A}}\delta^{\dot{\alpha}}_{\dot{A}}, \\
C^a &= \tfrac{e}{2}c_{\alpha\dot{A}}(\bar{\sigma}^a)^{\dot{A}\alpha}, \quad & C^{ab} &= -e(\bar{\sigma}^{ab})^{\dot{A}}{}_{\dot{\alpha}}c^{\dot{\alpha}}{}_{\dot{A}}, \quad & C &= -ec_{\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\dot{A}}\delta^{\dot{\alpha}}_{\dot{A}}, \\
\lambda_i &= \tfrac{e}{2}\lambda_{i\alpha\dot{A}}(\bar{\sigma}^a)^{\dot{A}\alpha}V_a, \quad & \lambda^{iab} &= -e(\bar{\sigma}^{ab})^{\dot{A}}{}_{\dot{\alpha}}\lambda^{i\dot{\alpha}}{}_{\dot{A}}, \quad & \tilde{\lambda}^i &= -e\lambda^i{}_{\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\dot{A}}\delta^{\dot{\alpha}}_{\dot{A}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

As an example of the action of the broker e, note that, while $\frac{1}{2}\psi_{\alpha\dot{A}}(\bar{\sigma}^a)^{\dot{A}\alpha}$ is a one-form, is a fermion and has ghost number zero, the true topological ghost $\tilde{\psi}^a$ must be a one-form, with ghost number one and it is a boson. In Ref. [10] the broker was not explicitly introduced, although it was implicitly assumed.

Up to nonlinear terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
sV^a &= \tilde{\psi}^a - d\varepsilon^a + \varepsilon^{ab}\wedge V_b, & s\varepsilon^a &= C^a, \\
s\varepsilon^{ab} &= -\tfrac{1}{2}F_0^{+ab}, & s\tilde{\psi}^a &= -dC^a + \tfrac{1}{2}F^{+ab}_{\ 0}\wedge V_b, \\
s\tilde{\psi}^{ab} &= -dC^{ab} + \tfrac{i}{2}\omega^{-ab}, & s\tilde{\psi} &= -dC, \\
sC^a &= 0, & sC^{ab} &= \tfrac{i}{2}\varepsilon^{-ab}, \\
sC &= 0, & s\lambda_i &= \tfrac{1}{2}dz_i, \\
s\lambda^{iab} &= iF_i^{-ab}, & s\tilde{\lambda}^i &= 0, \\
sA_i &= -dc_i + \lambda_i, & sc_i &= -\tfrac{1}{2}z_i, \\
sz_i &= 0, & s\bar{z}^i &= \tfrac{i}{2}\tilde{\lambda}^i, \\
sA_0 &= i\tilde{\psi} - dc_0, & sc_0 &= -\tfrac{1}{2} + iC.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Here $F^{-ab} = \frac{1}{2}(F^{ab} + \frac{i}{2}\varepsilon^{abcd}F_{cd})$ (with respect to Ref. [10] there is, in particular, a sign difference in the conventions for γ_5 and ε_{abcd}).

From Eq.s (5.5) and (5.6) we can directly identify what are the topological ghosts, the topological antighosts (up to interaction terms) and the topological gauge-fixings. More generally, one retrieves the topological meaning of the twisted versions of all the fields of the original theory. $\tilde{\psi}^a$ are the topological ghosts associated to the graviton, λ_i those associated to the matter vectors; the corresponding topological antighosts are $\tilde{\psi}^{ab}$ and λ^{iab}, respectively. The ghosts for ghosts are C^a, F_0^{+ab} and z_i, respectively for diffeomorphisms, Lorentz rotations and gauge transformations. $\bar{z}^i$ are antighosts for ghosts, while C^{ab} and

C are extraghosts. Let us discuss the gauge-fixings. They involve complicated expressions depending on the various fields (even in the topological σ-model in two dimensions [4] one finds convenient to impose a topological gauge-fixing depending on the ghosts), but they can be equivalently read when all the ghosts are set to zero, because in the minimum of the BRST action all the ghosts are zero by definition. To this purpose, the interaction terms are negligible (they always contain ghosts). Our expectations are confirmed: the theory does indeed describe Yang-Mills instantons $F_i^{-ab} = 0$ in a background gravitational instanton $\omega^{-ab} = 0$ (the Wick rotation to the Euclidean is of course understood, as in Ref. [10])[2].

We note that there are more observables than those we have constructed by means of the minimal BRST algebra (5.1). They involve also antighosts. In fact there is another noticeable differential form which is closed but not exact and which could be a source of nontrivial observables, namely the Kähler form K. In fact the Kähler potential G exists only locally and $K = dQ$ is only a local statement. The associated descent equations still give observables, however so far we have not revealed their deep meaning (if any). The Kähler form and its extended version are constructed with both ghosts and antighosts, while one usually uses only ghosts. We must remark that the topological Yang-Mills theory we have found is *not* exactly Witten's topological Yang-Mills theory coupled to gravity. In fact, Witten's theory is described by a flat Kähler manifold (and Q exists globally, so K is not interesting), while our theory corresponds to $\frac{SU(1,n)}{SU(n)\otimes U(1)}$ and K cannot be globally exact [16], so it cannot be *a priori* discarded. One has

$$K = ig_i{}^j \nabla z_j \wedge \nabla \bar{z}^i + \frac{i}{2} g(G_i k^{i\Lambda} - G^i k_i^\Lambda)(dA_\Lambda + f_\Lambda{}^{\Sigma\Pi} A_\Sigma \wedge A_\Pi). \tag{5.7}$$

The descent equations derived from $\hat{d}\hat{K} = 0$ give the following observables

$$\mathcal{O}^{(0)} = K_{(0,2)},$$

---

[2]Note that the BRST variation of the topological gravitational antighost $\tilde{\psi}^{ab}$ contains, in addition to the gauge-fixing ω^{-ab}, also the derivative of the extraghost C^{ab}. As explained in Ref. [10], this is due to the redundancy of the gauge conditions $\omega^{-ab} = 0$.

$$\mathcal{O}^{(1)}_{\gamma} = \int_{\gamma} K_{(1,1)},$$
$$\mathcal{O}^{(2)}_{S} = \int_{S} K, \tag{5.8}$$

where γ and S are one- and two-dimensional cycles, while

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{(0,2)} &= ig_i{}^j(Z_{j|a}\varepsilon^a + \bar\lambda^A_j c_A)\wedge(\bar Z^i_{|a}\varepsilon^a + \bar\lambda^i_B c^B) + \\
&- \frac{i}{2}g(G_j k^{j\Lambda} - G^j k^\Lambda_j)(\epsilon_{AB}L_\Lambda \bar c^A\wedge c^B + \epsilon^{AB}\bar L_\Lambda \bar c_A\wedge c_B - F^{ab}_\Lambda \varepsilon_a\wedge\varepsilon_b + \\
&- i(f^i_\Lambda \bar\lambda^A_i\gamma^a c^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{\Lambda i}\bar\lambda^i_A\gamma^a c_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge\varepsilon_a), \\
K_{(1,1)} &= ig_i{}^j(Z_{j|a}\varepsilon^a + \bar\lambda^A_j c_A)\wedge\nabla\bar z^i + ig_i{}^j\nabla z_j(\bar Z^i_{|a}\varepsilon^a + \bar\lambda^i_A c^A) + \\
&- \frac{i}{2}g(G_j k^{j\Lambda} - G^j k^\Lambda_j)(2\epsilon_{AB}L_\Lambda\bar\psi^A\wedge c^B + 2\epsilon^{AB}\bar L_\Lambda\bar\psi_A\wedge c_B + \\
&- 2F^{ab}_\Lambda V_a\wedge\varepsilon_b - i(f^i_\Lambda\bar\lambda^A_i\gamma^a c^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{\Lambda i}\bar\lambda^i_A\gamma^a c_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_a + \\
&- i(f^i_\Lambda\bar\lambda^A_i\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{\Lambda i}\bar\lambda^i_A\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge\varepsilon_a).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

The correspondence between the gauge-free algebra (5.1) and the complete BRST algebra (5.2) is realized by the following identifications

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi^a &= i(\bar c_A\wedge\gamma^a\psi^A + \bar\psi_A\wedge\gamma^a c^A) - A^{ab}\wedge\varepsilon^b = \tilde\psi^a + \cdots, \\
\phi^a &= i\bar c_A\wedge\gamma^a c^A = C^a + \cdots, \\
\chi^{ab} &= sA^{ab} - A^{ac}\varepsilon_c{}^b + \varepsilon^{ac}A_c{}^b + 2R^{ab}{}_{cd}V^c\varepsilon^d + i(\varepsilon_c\bar\psi_A + V_c\bar c_A)(2\gamma^{[a}\rho^{A|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho^{A|ab}) + \\
&+ i(\varepsilon_c\bar\psi^A + V_c\bar c^A)(2\gamma^{[a}\rho_A{}^{|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho_A{}^{|ab}) + 4G^{-ab}\epsilon^{AB}\bar\psi_A\wedge c_B + \\
&+ 4G^{+ab}\epsilon_{AB}\bar\psi^A\wedge c^B + \frac{i}{4}\varepsilon^{abcd}(\bar\psi_A\wedge\gamma_c c^B + \bar c_A\wedge\gamma_c\psi^B)(2\bar\lambda_{iB}\gamma_d\lambda^{iA} - \delta^A_B\bar\lambda_{iC}\gamma_d\lambda^{iC}), \\
\psi_i &= 2\epsilon_{AB}L_i\bar\psi^A\wedge c^B + 2\epsilon^{AB}\bar L_i\bar\psi_A\wedge c_B + \\
&- 2F^{ab}_i V_a\wedge\varepsilon_b - i(f^j_i\bar\lambda^A_j\gamma^a c^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{ij}\bar\lambda^j_A\gamma^a c_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge V_a + \\
&- i(f^j_i\bar\lambda^A_j\gamma^a\psi^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{ij}\bar\lambda^j_A\gamma^a\psi_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge\varepsilon_a = -\lambda_i + \cdots, \\
\phi_i &= -\epsilon_{AB}L_i\bar c^A\wedge c^B - \epsilon^{AB}\bar L_i\bar c_A\wedge c_B + F^{ab}_i\varepsilon_a\wedge\varepsilon_b + \\
&+ i(f^j_i\bar\lambda^A_j\gamma^a c^B\epsilon_{AB} + \bar f_{ij}\bar\lambda^j_A\gamma^a c_B\epsilon^{AB})\wedge\varepsilon_a = -\frac{1}{2}z_i + \cdots, \\
\eta^{ab} &= R^{ab}{}_{cd}\varepsilon^c\varepsilon^d - i\bar c_A(2\gamma^{[a}\rho^{A|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho^{A|ab})\varepsilon_c - i\bar c^A(2\gamma^{[a}\rho_A{}^{|b]c} - \gamma^c\rho_A{}^{|ab})\varepsilon_c + \\
&+ 2G^{-ab}\epsilon^{AB}\bar c_A\wedge c_B + 2G^{+ab}\epsilon_{AB}\bar c^A\wedge c^B +
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{i}{4}\varepsilon^{abcd}\bar{c}_A\wedge\gamma_c c^B(2\bar{\lambda}_{iB}\gamma_d\lambda^{iA}-\delta^A_B\bar{\lambda}_{iC}\gamma_d\lambda^{iC})=-\frac{1}{2}F_0^{+ab}+\cdots, \tag{5.10}$$

where $A^{ab}\wedge V_b=i\bar{\psi}_A\wedge\gamma^a\psi^A$ and the dots stand for nonlinear corrections.

Now we write the gauge fermion Ψ, the BRST variation of which is the quadratic part of the N=2 lagrangian, after topological twist and topological shift.

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi=&-16i(B^{ab}-i\omega^{-ab}+2dC^{ab})\wedge\tilde{\psi}_{ac}\wedge V_b\wedge V^c+8iF_0\wedge\psi^a\wedge V_a+\\&+\left(\frac{2}{3}\eta^{ab}\varepsilon_{ab}-\frac{1}{6}(M_{iab}-2iF^-_{iab})\lambda^{iab}\right)\varepsilon_{cdef}V^c\wedge V^d\wedge V^e\wedge V^f+\\&+\frac{4}{3}\lambda^a_i d\bar{z}^i\wedge\varepsilon_{abcd}V^b\wedge V^c\wedge V^d.\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Here, B^{ab} and M^{iab} are Lagrange multipliers ($s\tilde{\psi}^{ab}=B^{ab}$, $s\lambda^{iab}=M^{iab}$, $sB^{ab}=0$, $sM^{iab}=0$), while λ^a_i is such that $\lambda_i=\lambda^a_iV_a$.

VI. THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THE TWISTING PROCEDURE AND QUATERNIONIC TOPOLOGICAL σ-MODEL

In this section we discuss the topological twist of quaternionic matter multiplets [16] coupled to N=2 supergravity. We shall not develop the entire formalism in full detail, living it for a future publication, but we shall concentrate on some of its relevant aspects.

We already anticipated in the introduction that the twisting procedure as described by Witten [2] needs some modifications in order to work correctly. First of all, as shown in Ref. [10], the twist acts on the Lorentz group and does not touch the space-time indices. This was straightforward in the case of pure supergravity, since all the fields are one-forms, i. e. they are all on the same footing as far as space-time indices are concerned. Consequently the twist on the Lorentz group works in exactly the same way as the twist described by Witten. However, when studying the case of the Yang-Mills theory, one has to face the problem that the vector bosons A_i are one forms and Lorentz scalars, while the gauginos λ^A_i and λ^i_A are zero-forms and Lorentz spinors. If you are in flat space, you can mix Lorentz and Einstein indices and so the twist can work in the way described by Witten. However,

Witten himself notes [2] that his method works only in flat space, even if the result is valid in any curved space. If we follow our method, this problem is simply absent. We remain in the most general curved space and act only on the Lorentz indices. At this point, the twisted vector boson is still a one-form and a Lorentz scalar, while the twisted left handed gaugino $\lambda_i^a \equiv \frac{e}{2}\lambda_{i\alpha\dot{A}}(\bar{\sigma}^a)^{\dot{A}\alpha}$ is a zero-form and a Lorentz vector. From (5.6) you immediately read that the true topological antighost is not simply λ_i^a, but $\lambda_i = \lambda_i^a V_a$, i. e. the object that you obtain from the simple twist (λ_i^a) must be contracted with the vierbein V^a. λ_i is a one-form and a Lorentz scalar, as desired.

In order to show that the contraction with a vielbein plays a substantial role in the twisting procedure, one would like to exhibit a case in which this step is so important that no result can be obtained without it (even in flat space). This is precisely the case of the quaternionic σ-model. The multiplet consists of (q^i, ζ_I, ζ^I), where ζ_I and ζ^I are the left handed and right handed components of the spinors ($I = 1, \ldots 2m$), while q^i are the coordinates of a $4m$-dimensional manifold $\mathcal{Q}(m)$ ($i = 1, \ldots 4m$), with a quaternionic structure, namely possessing three complex structures J^x, $x = 1, 2, 3$, fulfilling the quaternionic algebra. Specifically $\mathcal{Q}(m)$ is a Hyperkähler manifold when gravity is not dynamical (i.e. it is external), while it is a quaternionic manifold when gravity is dynamical. As you see, no field has indices of $SU(2)_I$, i. e. all the fields are singlets under the internal $SU(2)$. Consequently, the usual twisting procedure acts trivially on hypermultiplets: the Lorentz scalars remain Lorentz scalars and the spinors remain spinors. In a moment we shall show how this problem can be solved by means of a contraction with a suitable vielbein.

The general feature of $\mathcal{Q}(m)$ is that its holonomy group $Hol(\mathcal{Q}(m))$ is contained in $SU(2) \otimes Sp(2m)$. This $SU(2)$ is nothing but $SU(2)_I$ [16]. In the Hyperkähler case, the $SU(2)$ part of the spin connection of $\mathcal{Q}(m)$ is flat, while in the quaternionic case its curvature is proportional to $\Omega^x = h_{ik}(J^x)^k_j dq^i \wedge dq^j$, where h_{ij} is the metric of $\mathcal{Q}(m)$. In both cases one can exploit another $SU(2)$, which will be denoted by $SU(2)_Q$, namely the $SU(2)$ factor in the $SU(2) \otimes SO(m)$ maximal subgroup of $Sp(2m)$. We shall see that the twisting procedure requires also a redefinition of $SU(2)_L$, namely

$$SU(2)_L \to SU(2)'_L = \mathrm{diag}[SU(2)_L \otimes SU(2)_Q]. \tag{6.1}$$

Summarizing, the complete twisting procedure can be divided in the following three steps. Step A corresponds to the redefinitions of $SU(2)_L$, $SU(2)_R$ and ghost number $U(1)_g$

$$\begin{aligned} SU(2)_L &\to SU(2)'_L = \mathrm{diag}[SU(2)_L \otimes SU(2)_Q], \\ SU(2)_R &\to SU(2)'_R = \mathrm{diag}[SU(2)_R \otimes SU(2)_I], \\ U(1)_g &\to U(1)'_g = \mathrm{diag}[U(1)_g \otimes U(1)_I], \\ {}^c(L,R,I,Q)^g_f &\to (L\otimes Q, R\otimes I)^{g+c}_f, \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where Q denotes the representation of $SU(2)_Q$. Step B is the correct identification of the topological ghosts (fields with $g+c=1$ from $g=0$, $c=1$) by contraction with a suitable vielbein (if it exists). Step 3 is the topological shift, namely the shift by a constant of the $(0,0)^0_0$ field coming from the right handed components of the supersymmetry ghosts.

Let us see how the contraction with a suitable vielbein can help when the usual twisting procedure does not give directly the true topological ghosts (i.e. it gives objects with the wrong spin assignment). Since the hypermultiplets are made of zero-forms, the vierbein V^a cannot help us. Fortunately, however, there *is* a vielbein that does the job, namely the quaternionic vielbein $\mathcal{U}^{AI}_i$ ($A=1,2$ is an index of $SU(2)_I$) [16]. We can for example take the contraction $\mathcal{U}^i_{AI}\bar{c}^A\zeta^I$, where $\mathcal{U}^i_{AI}$ is the inverse vielbein. After the topological shift, this expression becomes $-\frac{i}{2}e\mathcal{U}^i_{\dot{A}I}\zeta^{\dot{A}I}$, up to interaction terms, and is the natural candidate to become the topological ghost (it is also the *only* candidate). Here is another novelty: the topological ghost is constructed with the *right* handed components of the fermions, *not* the left handed ones. This means that the R-duality charge of ζ^I is $+1$ and that of ζ_I is -1, the opposite of what happens in the other cases that we have studied. This is not completely surprising, because the reasoning of Section II that established the R-duality charges of gravitinos and gauginos was essentially based on the effects of the usual redefinition of $SU(2)_R$ on the representations of the Lorentz group, effects that are absent in the present case. From Ref. [16] one can convince oneself that this is in fact the correct

charge assignment.

We report here only those terms in the BRST variations of the fields that correspond to supersymmetries, in order to spot the nature of the instantons described by the theory, reading the topological gauge-fixings.

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta q^i &= \mathcal{U}^i_{AI}(\epsilon^{AB}C^{IJ}\bar{c}_B\zeta_J + \bar{c}^A\zeta^I),\\
\delta\zeta_I &= i\mathcal{U}^{BJ}_a\gamma^a c^A\epsilon_{AB}C_{IJ},\\
\delta\zeta^I &= i\mathcal{U}^{AI}_a\gamma^a c_A,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

where C_{IJ} is the flat $Sp(2m)$ invariant metric while $\mathcal{U}^{AI}_a$ is the supercovariantized derivative of the quaternionic field q^i with indices flattened both with respect to spacetime and with respect to the quaternionic manifold via the corresponding vielbeins.

$$\mathcal{U}^{AI}_a = V^\mu_a(\mathcal{U}^{AI}_i\partial_\mu q^i - \epsilon^{AB}C^{IJ}\bar{\psi}_{\mu B}\zeta_J - \bar{\psi}_\mu{}^A\zeta^I). \tag{6.4}$$

The topological shift gives, up to nonlinear terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta q^i &= -\frac{i}{2}e\mathcal{U}^i_{\dot{A}I}(\zeta^{\dot{A}})^I \equiv \xi^i,\\
\delta(\zeta_\alpha)_I &= \frac{e}{2}\mathcal{U}^{\dot{B}J}_a(\sigma^a)_{\alpha\dot{B}}C_{IJ},\\
\delta(\zeta^{\dot{A}})^I &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

From this equation we realize that the topological symmetry is indeed the expected one for a σ-model, namely the map $q^i : M_{spacetime} \to \mathcal{Q}(m)$ can be continuously deformed. The topological ghosts ξ^i are exactly what we anticipated. In order to correctly identify the topological antighosts, we have to write the index I as the pair (α, k), where $\alpha = 1, 2$ is the doublet index of $SU(2)_Q$ and $k = 1, \dots m$ is the vector index of $SO(m)$, such that $C_{IJ} = C_{(\alpha,k)(\beta,l)}$ takes the form $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}\delta_{kl}$. Now we write

$$\delta(\zeta_\alpha)_{\beta k} = \frac{e}{2}\mathcal{U}^{\dot{B}\gamma l}_a(\sigma^a)_{\alpha\dot{B}}\epsilon_{\beta\gamma}\delta_{kl} = \frac{e}{2}\mathcal{U}^{\dot{B}\gamma k}_a(\sigma^a)_{\alpha\dot{B}}\epsilon_{\beta\gamma}. \tag{6.6}$$

At this point we can introduce the vielbein $E^{ak}_i \equiv \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{U}^{\dot{A}\alpha k}_i(\sigma^a)_{\alpha\dot{A}}$ and the true topological antighosts $\zeta^{+ab}_k = -e(\sigma^{ab})_\alpha{}^\beta\epsilon^{\alpha\gamma}(\zeta_\beta)_{\gamma k}$ and $\zeta_k = -e\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}(\zeta_\alpha)_{\beta k}$, which, under the Lorentz group transform as $(1,0)$ and $(0,0)$ respectively. One finds

$$\delta\zeta^{+abk} = 2V^{\mu[a}E_i^{b]+k}\partial_\mu q^i,$$
$$\delta\zeta^k = V_a^\mu E_i^{ak}\partial_\mu q^i, \tag{6.7}$$

where $[ab]^+$ means selfdualization in the indices a, b. Thus we see that *both* ζ_k^{+ab} and ζ_k are topological antighosts (otherwise we would have not enough equations to fix the gauge completely). In the previously studied cases, instead, the $(0,1)$ components were the only topological antighosts, while the $(0,0)$ component permitted to fix the gauge freedom of the topological ghosts (directly related to the gauge freedom of the gauge freedom, which now is missing). Thus, the instantons described by this theory (which we name *hyperinstantons*) are given by the following equations

$$V^{\mu[a}E_i^{b]+k}\partial_\mu q^i = 0,$$
$$V_a^\mu E_i^{ak}\partial_\mu q^i = 0. \tag{6.8}$$

In a certain sense, Eq. (6.8) define a condition of holomorphicity of the maps $M_{spacetime} \to \mathcal{Q}(m)$ with respect to the three complex (or almost complex) structures J^x of $\mathcal{Q}(m)$. For this reason we find it proper to name triholomorphic a map q satisfying Eq. (6.8). In conclusion, in the same way as the instantons of topological σ-models in D=2 are given by holomorphic maps, those of topological σ-models in D=4 are given by triholomorphic maps.

If gravity is external ($\mathcal{Q}(m)$ is Hyperkähler) then the gravitational background should be restricted by the need to have N=2 global supersymmetry, however, the proof that the solutions to the above equations are indeed instantons works for any background and is based on the following identity

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}} d^4x\sqrt{-g}g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu q^i\partial_\nu q^j h_{ij} = 2\int_{\mathcal{M}} d^4x\sqrt{-g}[(V_a^\mu E_i^{ak}\partial_\mu q^i)^2 + 4(V^{\mu[a}E_i^{b]+k}\partial_\mu q^i)^2] +$$
$$- 4i\int_{\mathcal{M}} E^{[ak}\wedge E^{b]-k}\wedge V_a\wedge V_b, \tag{6.9}$$

where $h_{ij} = 2E_i^{ak}E_j^{bk}\eta_{ab}$ is the metric of $\mathcal{Q}(m)$, while $E^{ak} \equiv E_i^{ak}dq^i$. The form $E^{[ak}\wedge E^{b]-k}\wedge V_a\wedge V_b$ is proportional to $\Omega^x\wedge V_a\wedge V_b$ (the coefficient, which is a numerical matrix M_x^{ab} antiselfdual in ab is not important), where Ω^x are the 2-forms introduced above. Ω_x are

closed forms of $\mathcal{Q}(m)$ if $\mathcal{Q}(m)$ is Hyperkähler. Consequently, in such a case the last term of (6.9) is a topological invariant and this completes our proof.

In the case gravity is dynamical ($\mathcal{Q}(m)$ is quaternionic) there exist three forms ω_x such that

$$\begin{aligned} &d\Omega_x + \varepsilon_{xyz}\omega^y \wedge \Omega^z = 0, \\ &d\omega_x + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{xyz}\omega^y \wedge \omega^z = \Omega_x. \end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

The definition of the curvatures changes drastically with respect to the case of pure N=2 supergravity [16], in the sense that the curvature ρ^A of the right handed components of the gravitinos contains a term that modifies the gravitational topological gauge-fixing, after performing the topological twist and the topological shift. This means that the gravitational instantons are no longer described by an antiselfdual spin connection. As a matter of fact $\rho^A = \mathcal{D}\psi^A + \frac{i}{2}\epsilon^{AB}\epsilon_{CD}(\sigma_x)_B{}^C\psi^D$, where $(\sigma_x)_A{}^B$ are the Pauli matrices and the resulting instantons are given by

$$\omega^{-ab} - \frac{i}{2}M_x^{ab}\omega^x = 0. \tag{6.11}$$

There exist only one matrix with the properties of M_x^{ab}, up to a multiplicative constant, and this constant can be fixed by the fact that $M_x^{ac}M_y^{db}\eta_{cd}\varepsilon^{xy}{}_z = 2iM_x^{ab}$ (see for example section 5 of [20]). The proof that the hyperinstantons that solve Eq.s (6.8) and (6.11) are effectively instantons follows from the fact that the total kinetic lagrangian (Einstein lagrangian plus σ-model kinetic lagrangian) can be written as a sum of squares of the left hand sides of the above equations up to a total derivative

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{kin} &= \varepsilon_{abcd}R^{ab} \wedge V^c \wedge V^d - \frac{1}{6}\varepsilon_{abcd}V^a \wedge V^b \wedge V^c \wedge V^d g^{\mu\nu}h_{ij}\partial_\mu q^i \partial_\nu q^j = \\ &= 4i(\omega^{-ab} - \frac{i}{2}M_x^{ab}\omega^x) \wedge (\omega_{-ac} - \frac{i}{2}M_{acy}\omega^y) \wedge V_b \wedge V^c + \\ &- \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon_{cdef}V^c \wedge V^d \wedge V^e \wedge V^f [4(V^{\mu[a}E_i^{b]+k}\partial_\mu q^i)^2 + (V_a^\mu E_i^{ak}\partial_\mu q^i)^2] + \\ &+ \text{total derivative}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

As an example, let us consider the simplest case, namely the case $m = 1$, $\mathcal{Q}(1) = H^1$, with the standard flat metric. We have $\mathcal{U}^i_{A\alpha} = (\sigma^i)_{\alpha\dot{A}}$ and $E_i^a = \delta_i^a$.

The hyperinstantons satisfy

$$V^{\mu[a}\partial_\mu q^{b]^+} = 0,$$
$$V^\mu_a \partial_\mu q^a = 0. \tag{6.13}$$

If we further specialize the example, namely we choose flat spacetime metric, we have

$$\partial_{[\mu} q_{\nu]^+} = 0,$$
$$\partial_\mu q^\mu = 0. \tag{6.14}$$

If you imagine that q_μ is an abelian four vector, the hyperinstantons are the selfdual solutions in the Lorentz gauge. But now $\partial_\mu q^\mu = 0$ is a true equation and not a choice of gauge. In particular, all harmonic forms $q = q_\mu dx^\mu$ are solutions (they would be the residual gauge freedom in the interpretation of q_μ as a four potential and so they would not be true solutions).

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that, with appropriate procedure and relying on an appropriate symmetry (R-duality), all N=2, D=4 theories can be topologically twisted, just as it happens of N=2 theories in two dimensions. This possibility introduces a set of new topological field theories, each of which describes intersection theory in the moduli-space of certain interesting geometrical structures. Some of these structures are, as far as we know, new or at least not well estabilished in the mathematical literature.

To be specific, let us enumerate these theories.

i) The twist of N=2 σ-models in flat background, whose target space is a Hyperkähler manifold, introduces the notion of a topological hyperkählerian σ-model, where the appropriate instantons are the triholomorphic maps (hyperinstantons). Correlation functions in this theory will be intersection integrals in the moduli-space of triholomorphic maps: a subject that to our knowledge has not been so far developed and certainly deserves careful investigation.

ii) The twist of N=2 supergravity minimally coupled to vector multiplets yields a topological theory where the instantons are gauge instantons living in the background of gravitational instantons. The moduli-space of these structures is the arena where correlation functions of our theory have to be calculated. Making an analogy with the 2-dimensional world, our theory stands to topological Yang-Mills theory as the topological matter models coupled to topological gravity stand to pure topological minimal models in D=2.

iii) Similarly, twisting N=2 σ-models coupled to N=2 supergravity, one obtains a topological σ-model where the target space is quaternionic and which interacts with topological gravity. The instantons of this theory are interesting objects. They correspond to the quaternionic analogue of triholomorphic maps living in the background of generalized gravitational instantons. The space-time spin connection is no longer selfdual but its antiselfdual part is identified with the $SU(2)$ part of the spin connection on the quaternionic manifold. This is a phenomenon similar to the embedding of the spin connection into the gauge connection occurring in string compactifications.

iv) Twisting the complete N=2 matter coupled supergravity, one obtains a topological theory where all the above instantons are fused together: gravitational, gauge and hyperinstantons. To our knowledge, no study of the moduli-space of such structures has been attempted.

v) Alternatively, one can also study the twist on N=2 hyperkählerian σ-models coupled to N=2 super Yang-Mills. In this case we have the fusion of gauge and hyperinstantons.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Its a pleasure to thank R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and P. Soriani for illuminating and inspiring discussions.

REFERENCES

[1] For a review see D. Birmingham, M. Blau and M. Rakowski, Phys. Rep. 209 (1991) 129.

[2] E. Witten, Commun. Math. Phys. 117 (1988) 353.

[3] S. K. Donaldson, J. Diff. Geom. 18 (1983) 279.

[4] E. Witten, Commun. Math. Phys. 118 (1988) 411.

[5] C. Vafa, Mod. Phys. Lett. A6 (1990) 337; R. Dijkgraaf, E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde, Nucl. Phys. B352 (1991) 59, B. Block and A. Varchenko, Prepr. IASSNS-HEP-91/5; E. Verlinde and N. P. Warner, Phys. Lett. 269B (1991) 96; A. Klemm, S. Theisen and M. Schmidt, Prepr. TUM-TP-129/91, KA-THEP-91-00, HD-THEP-91-32; Z. Maassarani, Prepr. USC-91/023; P. Fre' , L. Girardello, A. Lerda, P. Soriani, Preprint SISSA/92/EP, Nucl. Phys. in press; B. Dubrovin, Napoli preprint, INFN-NA-4-91/26.

[6] P. Candelas, C. T. Horowitz, A. Strominger and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B258 (1985) 46; P. Candelas, A. M. Dale, C. A. Lutken and R. Schimmrick, Nucl. Phys. B298 (1988) 493; M. Linker and R. Schimmrick, Phys. Lett. 208B (1988) 216; C. A. Lutken and G. C. Ross, Phys. Lett. 213B (1988) 152; P. Zoglin, Phys. Lett. 218B (1989) 444; P. Candelas, Nucl. Phys. B298 (1988) 458; P. Candelas and X. de la Ossa, Nucl. Phys. B342 (1990) 246.

[7] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B340 (1990) 281; E. Verlinde, H. Verlinde, Surveys in Diff. Geom. 1 (1991) 243; M. Kontsevich, Comm. Math. Phys. 147 (1992) 1; R. Dijkgraaf, E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B342 (1990) 486; L. Bonora, C.S. Xiong, SISSA preprint 161/92/EP.

[8] A.M. Polyakov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A2 (1987) 893; V.G. Knizhnik, A.M. Polyakov, A.B. Zamolochikov, Mod. Phys. Lett. A3 (1988) 819; J. Distler, H. Kawai, Nucl. Phys. B231 (1989) 509; F. David, Mod. Phys. Lett. A3 (1988) 207; V. Kazakov, Phys. Lett. 150B (1985) 282; D.J. Gross, A.A. Migdal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 717; M. Douglas, S.

Schenker, Nucl. Phys. B335 (1990) 635; E. Brezin, V. Kazakov, Phys. Lett. 236B (1990) 144.

[9] L. Bonora, P. Pasti, M. Tonin, Ann. Phys. 144 (1982) 15; L. Beaulieu, M. Bellon, Nucl. Phys. B294 (1987) 279.

[10] D. Anselmi, P. Frè, "Twisted N=2 Supergravity as Topological Gravity in Four Dimensions", preprint, SISSA 125/92/EP, July, 1992; to appear in Nucl. Phys. B.

[11] M. K. Gaillard, B. Zumino, Nucl. Phys. B193 (1981) 221.

[12] See, for example, P. Fayet, S. Ferrara, Phys. Rep. 35C (1977) 249; R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara, D.V. Nanopoulos, K.S. Stelle, Phys. Lett. 113B (1982) 219; A. Salam, J. Strathdee, Nucl. Phys. B87 (1985) 85.

[13] B. de Wit, A. van Proeyen, Nucl. Phys. B245 (1984) 89.

[14] E. Cremmer in "Supersymmetry and its Applications", edited by G.W. Gibbons, S.W. Hawking, P.K. Townsend, Cambridge University Press, 1985.

[15] A. D. Dolgov, I. B. Khriplovich, A. I. Vainshtein, V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B315 (1989) 138.

[16] R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Frè, Nucl. Phys. B359 (1991) 705.

[17] L. Castellani, R. D'Auria, P. Frè, "Supergravity and Superstrings", World Scientific, 1991.

[18] L. Castellani, A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara, P. Frè, E. Maina, Nucl. Phys. B286 (1986) 317.

[19] E. Cremmer, J. Scherk, Nucl. Phys. B127 (1977) 259.

[20] M. Billò, P. Frè, L. Girardello, A. Zaffaroni, preprint SISSA 159/92/EP, IFUM/431/FT.